

1192

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.



Alumni Library Fund



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-AVA-354

THEOLOGICAL ROOM

THEOLOGICAL ROOM

Gathered Papers

BY

HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.

VICAR OF ST. THOMAS'S, CAMDEN TOWN

AUTHOR OF 'THE FATAL OPULENCE OF BISHOPS'

EDITOR OF 'A DECLARATION ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM'

AND OF 'ANGLICAN LIBERALISM'

'The position I have come to these last years is . . . one which an Anglican can hold *honestly*, but which a Romanist holds only by an equivocation. Any other sect ties you to a spot—Anglicanism gives you a wide range.' FATHER TYRRELL.

'For who knows not that Truth is strong next to the Almighty? She needs no policies, no stratagems, nor licencings to make her victorious. . . . Give her but room.' MILTON.

LONDON

CONSTABLE AND COMPANY LTD

1914

THEOLOGICAL ROOM
GATHERED PAPERS
BY
HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
LONDON
CONSTABLE AND COMPANY LTD
1914

206
H 192

60301

WABER GRT 100
YABU
YABU WAB

TO
H. B. A. H.

Things change—but not my darling ;
Things fail—but not my dear ;
I fail myself and stumble,
But not when she is near.

Oh ! in my deepest being,
And in my inmost life,
May God keep strong and holy
My love for her—my wife.

P R E F A C E

THANKS are offered to the Editors of the several named journals and reviews for permission to reprint these Papers. Amendments occur here and there in the text, due to changed view or changed circumstances. A few of the original dissimilarities in spelling survive.

The adjectives 'Modernist,' 'Liberal,' and 'Broad Church' are used as equivalent. Each expression, no doubt, is entitled to its own individuality and is rich in its own implications. But the three terms are inwardly akin, and the writer desires that the substance and virtue of them all shall be found in the treasure of the Church of England.

The last seven essays, though they shelter under the hospitable title 'Theological Reform,' are practical. They deal for the most part with matters of money—secular money in its present trial, ecclesiastical money amid its exceeding and inveterate temptations.

Two events, made known while this volume is on its way to the press, are charged for us with meaning and encouragement. First, the Bampton Lecturer for 1915 is to be a Liberal

teacher of lofty and reverent character, of eminent intellect, of European repute: a captain in the Broad Church Militant who has led the van and borne the brunt of our struggle for many years—Canon Rashdall. Secondly, Canon Sanday, the venerable scholar who stands for sagacity, for balance, for the judicial temper, has, by an act of superb fidelity amid the lengthening shadows of life, avowed his own conversion to ‘a sound and right Modernism.’

For revision of proof-sheets I am grateful to my old friends, the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, Rector of Winford, and the Rev. Fergus Wood, Vicar of Caterham Valley.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION : THE RESOLUTION OF BISHOPS AND THE LIBERAL CLERGY	xiii

PART I. THEOLOGICAL

I. WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN	3
(The <i>Nineteenth Century</i> , September 1885)	
APPENDIX TO I. : Four unpublished Letters on clerical veracity from (1) the Rev. Mark Pattison ; (2) Bishop Fraser of Manchester ; (3) the Rev. Principal Tulloch ; (4) (dictated) Thomas Carlyle .	19
II. THE BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE	23
(The <i>Nineteenth Century and After</i> , June 1905)	
III. AN APPEAL TO THE DEAN AND CANONS OF WESTMINSTER	62
(The <i>Nineteenth Century and After</i> , April 1903)	
IV. THE EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE WORK OF A CHRISTIAN PASTOR	72
(The <i>Hibbert Journal</i> , April 1913)	
V. THE REAL CRISIS IN THE CHURCH	89
(A Letter to the <i>Times</i> , 7th September 1899)	
APPENDIX TO V. : A Letter on the subject from the Rev. Brooke Lambert, Vicar of Greenwich	96
VI. THE LIBERAL SERMON IN THE PARISH CHURCH	98
(A Paper read to a body of Liberal Clergy, 26th May 1913)	

	PAGE
VII. THE SECRET OF PERSONAL INFLUENCE, AND THE NEED	113
(An Address delivered to a body of Liberal Clergy at the Service of Holy Communion, 9th May 1912)	
VIII. OUGHT THERE TO BE A BROAD CHURCH DISRUPTION?	122
(The <i>Hibbert Journal</i> , January 1914)	
APPENDIX TO VIII.: THE BISHOP OF OXFORD AND THE LIBERAL CLERGY	144
PART II. PRACTICAL	
IX. PUBLIC JUDGMENT AGAINST THE FATAL OPULENCE OF BISHOPS	153
(A Letter to the <i>Guardian</i> , 19th June 1901)	
APPENDIX TO IX.: A DECADE OF EPISCOPAL INACTION	158
X. THE WRONG OF EPISCOPAL FINANCE	163
(A Paper read before the Church Congress, Great Yarmouth, 1st October 1907)	
XI. A DAILY BREAD MISSION TO THE RICH	175
(The <i>Contemporary Review</i> , April 1914)	
XII. KING EDWARD VII. AND A SIMPLER NATIONAL LIFE	188
(An Article in the <i>Guardian</i> , 23rd January 1907)	
APPENDIX TO XII.: The Note submitting a copy of this Article to King Edward, and the King's acknowledgment	197
XIII. A PROPOSED PETITION TO KING EDWARD VII. AGAINST LUXURY	198
(Church Conference of the Deanery of St. Pancras, 27th October 1908)	

CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
XIV. PAROCHIAL IDEALS	201
(A Letter to the People of St. Thomas's Parish, Camden Town, N.W., April 1914)	
XV. NATIONAL IDEALS	216
(A Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on the Second Sunday in Advent, 5th December 1909)	
SUPPLEMENT: TWO PETITIONS FOR FREEDOM—	
(i) THE ONE FROM THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION;	
(ii) THE OTHER FROM THIRTY-SIX EMINENT CHURCHMEN.	227
INDEX	235

INTRODUCTION

THE RESOLUTION OF BISHOPS AND THE LIBERAL CLERGY

ON 30th April 1914 the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation resolved by twenty-five votes, two Bishops abstaining in dissent, as follows :

‘ We express our deliberate judgment that the denial of any of the historical facts stated in the Creeds goes beyond the limits of legitimate interpretation, and gravely imperils that sincerity of profession which is plainly incumbent on the ministers of Word and Sacrament. At the same time, recognising that our generation is called to face new problems raised by historical criticism, we are anxious not to lay unnecessary burdens upon consciences, nor unduly to limit freedom of thought and inquiry, whether among clergy or among laity. We desire, therefore, to lay stress on the need of considerateness in dealing with that which is tentative and provisional in the thought and work of earnest and reverent students.’

The Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Talbot),

favouring the resolution, is reported in the *Times* to have uttered a desire for himself 'to be patient, equitable, and respectful to those students who in their critical inquiries came to conclusions which they could not accept as permanently consistent with the Church's faith, but which they held primarily as students of scholarship, or in a tentative way.' The Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Gore) 'fully accepted the word "denial" [apparently as distinguished from terms such as 'hesitation,' 'incertitude,' 'suspension of judgment'] in the resolution, but he was quite sure they needed to be extremely tender with all trials and doubts.' 'Earnest students,' said the Bishop of Ely (Dr. Chase), 'must examine matters which to many devout believers seemed painful, strange, and full of hazard.' 'No one in that House,' said the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Gibson), 'wished to charge men with the insincerity of conscious hypocrisy.'

Three observations occur here :

(1) Authority is necessarily, by its very nature, in its bone and blood conservative. It must be conservative. It ought to be conservative.

There is the lonely, daring soul, in whose

depths is living, throbbing faith. This is the reality. This is *religion*. And over against it is set—checking, damping, marring, as it seems—*official authority*; imposing upon the new, vigorous growth the restrictions of the past; casting into the eye of that forward and boundless vision that antiquated dust. Thus these two objects, religion and official authority, appear at first to be conflicting. Are they?

No! they are correlative; the one is complementary to the other. Cherish that vitality of religion in the prophetic individual. But he needs the check, the support, the correction, the sustenance of official authority. *It* is the mouthpiece of the *status quo*, from which he must start. It is the voice of the mighty heritage of the past, to which he owes most. It is the expression of the beliefs of the vast mass of average men, or it ought to be; it is the expression of his own beliefs in his average, rather than in his rarer and inspired, moments. He is a 'Broad' Churchman; but he must have something to 'broaden,' and official authority will tell him what it is. Official authority expresses the substantive to his adjective. It expresses, coldly and dryly, the familiar permanence, to which his insight

suggests the high and intermittent novelty. It represents the conservative principle, and he the progressive. When he, battered and tested by oppugnant forces, shall at length have made good his case, at the ripe moment, authority will yield and will open the door ; and the once heretical merchandise will be quietly passed through into the depots of orthodoxy.¹

(2) Authority here, in the above resolution and speeches of our Bishops, expresses itself with a noble sympathy and restraint. ‘Considerateness,’ ‘anxious not to lay unnecessary burdens upon consciences,’ ‘anxious not . . . unduly to limit freedom of thought and inquiry,’ ‘patient, equitable, and respectful,’ ‘extremely tender’—these phrases are honourable and welcome. Contrast the antipathy and violence sounding through the famous Encyclical of Pius x.: ‘The partisans of error are to be sought . . . in the Church’s very bosom. . . . The danger is present almost in the very veins and heart of the Church. . . . There is no part

¹ This relationship of official authority to progressive religion was illuminated for the present writer in a paper which, some years ago, he was privileged to hear read by Baron Fr. von Hügel. Of course, the majesty of authority and the awful sacredness of the thing society, whether civil or spiritual, have for English people especially been revealed by the genius of Burke.

of Catholic truth which they leave untouched, none that they do not strive to corrupt.' 'Pride sits in Modernism as in its own house.' 'We decree that in every diocese . . . a Council of Vigilance be instituted without delay. . . . They shall watch most carefully for every trace and sign of Modernism . . . to preserve it from the clergy and the young.' Or contrast the Scotch severities, a generation ago, in the trial of William Robertson Smith. The 'First Libel,' or indictment, against him in the Free Church Assembly dealt with a rigid view of Biblical inspiration, and declared it an offence (a) to deny this doctrine, (b) [the italics are mine] *to tend to deny it*, and (c) *to adopt a neutral or not sufficiently cordial attitude regarding it*.¹

(3) Liberal Clergy should meet generosity with gratitude. They may deplore the resolution of Convocation. 'Mistakes have been made,' Dr. Gore confessed, 'in the course of Church history by Bishops assembled in Synod.' Liberal Clergy will, I believe, venture to think that a mistake was made here; will venture to agree with the small abstaining minority of Bishops that the resolving majority of Bishops

¹ See *The Life and Lectures of William Robertson Smith*, by J. Sutherland Black.

committed in judgment and policy an error. Again, if a plain vicar may say so, the Liberal Clergy cannot give up their principle. The fort of Clerical Liberalism they are here to hold, and hold it they must. But the animus of our Fathers in God in this debate is fatherly, pastoral, gentle. Their spirit should awake Christian echoes in ours; should evoke a knightly response. More than ever we Liberal Clergy ought, in every way that is possible, towards our ecclesiastical superiors to strive to be scrupulous, reliable, and loyal. *Auctoritas patiendo vincitur.*

PART I
THEOLOGICAL

I

WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

(The *Nineteenth Century*, September 1885)

THERE are a great many young University men who have wished, above everything, to be clergymen, who yet, in the present state of things, do not take Orders. That is a fact which the men themselves would not, perhaps, think very important ; they would regret it, but they would not of themselves think that it could claim any notice in a review such as is the *Nineteenth Century*. It appears, however, that leaders of the English Church complain of this fact, complain of it over and over again, emphasise it, and even say that it is one of the most serious of the dangers which confront Christianity in England. If this is so, if what those who are older and wiser say is true, one of the excluded young men is not wrong, perhaps, in trying to state quite shortly some of their hindrances. He has no particular qualification for the attempt, unless it be a passionate

4 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

fondness for the English Church, and a disappointment, greater than he can tell, at being shut out from its ministry; but it may be that the obstacles in a case like this—an ordinary case, not the case of a gifted, an exceptional man—are just those which may throw most light upon the general difficulty, and that the statement of them may thus lose its insignificance and find its excuse.

In 1865, as is well known, was passed an Act of Parliament relaxing the then existing method of subscription to the XXXIX Articles and the Prayer Book. The object of the Act may be learned from some words of the debate upon it in the House of Commons. Mr. Buxton, one of its chief promoters, thus explained it: ‘He thought that the change was one of great importance, and he also thought that the precedent now established was in itself of great value. It was a remarkable fact that a Commission including eight archbishops and bishops, and several other dignitaries of the Church, should have unanimously agreed to sweep away the whole of the existing declarations required from the clergy, and to substitute a perfectly new one, and that this reform should also have been acquiesced in by Convocation; and he

WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN 5

confidently maintained that the change thus unanimously agreed to was radical in its kind, though it might be too moderate in degree. . . . Having been himself a member of the Commission which proposed the change, he was in a position to affirm that it was the express intention of the Commission to relieve the extravagant stringency of the existing tests—in other words, to make it possible for men to minister at the altars of the Church although they might dissent from some part of her teaching, provided, however, they accepted it as a whole.’ That clearly explains the object of the Act, as understood by its framers and supporters. This object was to be attained by substituting for the old strict, particular assent to the XXXIX Articles and Prayer Book the following general one: ‘I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the united Church of England and Ireland, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.’

6 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

The end of this reform, then, was to give greater freedom of opinion to the clergy, and, presumably, to open wider the doors into the clerical office. The means were the relaxing, the generalising of the assent to the Church formularies. The efficacy of the reform, so far as it affects candidates for Ordination, may be tested in the following manner.

Suppose a young man to be at Oxford. During his course there he has felt—no University man can help feeling—something of the new life, and thought, and knowledge with which the air is charged. He has had to fight the anti-Christian and non-Christian speculative ghosts, atheistic, agnostic, and others, which, in greater numbers and more varied forms than ever, to-day await and haunt every awakening intelligence ; has had to fight them, and, thanks to the old priceless early home training, to high companionship, and to other help not to be named here, has been enabled to lay them. In questions of *religion*, as distinguished from philosophy, science, history, he feels now on sure, on unassailable ground : he feels that in such questions the little child, and not the *savant*, is the judge ; that in this sphere there is insight, there are truths which are

WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN 7

independent of intellectual power and acquirements. But there remain questions which are only partly within the religious sphere, which touch religion only at points, but belong largely to the strictly intelligent sphere. Such questions are, in science, the theory of evolution; in history, the various theories of modern Biblical criticism. For understanding and judgment of these questions are needed many years—a lifetime, perhaps—of appropriate study. What is this young man to think of them? It must not be supposed that in his case these theories have been sought out and welcomed, that to him they have any attraction: to him they all are startling; presented in some forms they are most repulsive; but they are in the air, and it is impossible, even if it were truthful, to escape them. What, then, is he to think of them? He sees that they are saturating educated opinion: he, in his obscurity, cannot reject them. Their solution requires age, experience, learning; he, young, inexperienced, ignorant, feels that he cannot really hold any well-grounded notion about them, that he can only wait quietly, confidently for the truest and best explanation. Towards these questions of science and history

8 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

the attitude of this man's mind must be one merely of expectation and hope. But he wishes to take Orders ; he has always wished so—since he was a child. He examines, then, the declaration required by the Act of 1865. ‘I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.’ The XXXIX Articles, useful as they have been, were compiled in an age when those scientific and historical theories were unknown, and in a mental attitude hostile to them ; the beautiful, solemn, sacred Prayer Book, invaluable as it is, strikes some notes which do not harmonise with these thoughts of to-day. To what, then, does this ‘assent’ commit him ? Does it tie up his thoughts for life upon subjects upon which, as has been seen, his thoughts cannot be bound ? How general is this assent ? Wherein may he differ ? These are the questions that beset and puzzle him, and to them he can find no satisfactory answers. He asks advice of friends, of college tutors, of Church dignitaries. They all are kind and good ; but they all seem to have different principles of interpretation, different measures of comprehension, different standards of sincerity ; with

the most generous intentions they seem to darken rather than to clear his perplexity. It is true that many clergymen differ from the Church formularies more widely than he ; but that is nothing ; that is their affair. For him, he has to go down into the depths of his own integrity and to ask, Can I, with the purest and highest good faith, make this declaration ? The answer comes that he cannot. He does not. He is not, therefore, a clergyman.

That is a slight sketch of a young man prevented from taking Orders at the present day. There are, it is believed, many such men. It must not be thought that they incline to tamper with the great inviolable Christian Faith : it is hallowed to them ; they have no words to express their reverence for it, their affection for it ; their hope for it is inexhaustible ; their belief in it is inextinguishable. It is said that modern intellectual Europe disowns Christianity: those men would cling to it—always. ‘Great objects exact a venture, and a sacrifice is the condition of honour.’ ‘Oportet te stultum fieri propter Christum, si vis religiosam ducere vitam.’ It is in this spirit, against these odds—aware of the venture, the sacrifice, the reproach—that these men wish to fight for ‘the old religion.’

10 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

But all this cannot blind their eyes to the rational questions that are disturbing and perplexing their generation. Forty years ago Cardinal (then Mr.) Newman said, 'In the present day there are new sciences, especially physical, which we all look at with anxiety, feeling that our views, *as we at present hold them*, are unequal to them, yet feeling also that no truth can really exist external to Christianity.' That expresses the feeling of these men now. They feel that it is *possible* that certain physical and historical views that have been associated with Christianity will need modification, or expansion, or readjustment. There would be no essential change: it would be as the development of a man at the end of, say, five years, as compared with the same man at the beginning of the five years; there would be no loss of identity. And this change would come, if at all, only when it seemed false and double-minded to oppose it. 'The great principle of Luther was to withdraw from the doctrine and customs of the Church only when the words of Scripture rendered it absolutely necessary. "Where has Christ ordered the host to be elevated and shown to the people?" asked Carlstadt. "And where has Christ for-

WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN 11

bidden it ? ” replied Luther.’ So, to pass from great to small, the principle of these men is not to accept any modern scientific or historical theory unless it be shown to be indubitable, unless it be verified and admitted as, in the past, has been the case with the theories of the earth’s motion round the sun and of the interpolation and parabolical interpretation of some parts of Scripture. Even while admitting the possibility of such changes they do not seek them, do not court them ; they take their stand upon the Christian Faith ¹ and let modern theories (if proved to be true) group themselves around that ; they do not take their stand upon modern theories and let a maimed and mutilated Christianity fall in with them as best it can. But when they come to you, sirs, for admission into the clerical body, you ask them to sign a paper which binds them to they know not what ; which may be interpreted as making them promise to entertain—now and all their lives—certain views upon questions of science

¹ Here the Christian Faith is treated as allowing proved theories ‘ around ’ it. Elsewhere in this paper the Christian Faith is treated as ‘ enclosing ’ all knowledge apprehensible by men. There is no intended contradiction. In the one case is the Faith subjective, the centre of consciousness. In the other is the Faith objective, the circumference of truth.

12 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

and history which they have not studied, and can know little about; which allows them in the sphere of secular knowledge, upon questions which exercise many of the most gifted minds of the day, no scope, no freedom, no growth. This they cannot sign.

The Act of 1865, then, seems to many men to be inadequate. In the House of Commons debates upon the Act almost all the speakers took this view of it. Speaking of the general as a substitute for the particular assent, one said that 'the whole was made up of different parts, and he was at a loss to understand how a man of candour could say that his conscience was relieved by that measure.' Another regarded the Bill as 'an advance, although a small one, in the right direction.' Another, as has been said, spoke of it as 'too moderate in degree.' The object seems to have been universally commended. The end is good; the means are insufficient. Efficient means, further reform have been sought by distinguished men in both the ecclesiastical and the lay world. This further reform may be shortly noticed, as there are some indications of a movement in this direction.

Subscription, declaration of assent, might be

WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN 13

omitted ; and, at Ordination, clergymen might promise to use, in public services, only the Church formularies, and to teach nothing in opposition to them. This, while it precludes any contradiction of the Church's doctrine, allows the individual to breathe, to live, and learn in the world of knowledge. Nearly two hundred years ago Archbishop Tillotson drew up his proposals for comprehension, of which the chief is this : ' That instead of all former declarations and subscriptions to be made by ministers, it shall be sufficient for them that are admitted to the exercise of their ministry in the Church of England to subscribe one general declaration and promise to this purpose, viz. " That we do submit to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church of England as it shall be established by law, and promise to teach and preach accordingly." ' '

Eminent ecclesiastics of our own times may be quoted in favour of this change. ' It is enough,' wrote the present Dean of Llandaff ¹ more than twenty years ago, ' to justify your place among the ministers of a National Church if you can say from the heart, that of the various Christian communities known to you

¹ Dr. C. J. Vaughan.

14 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

in this country this is the one which most commends itself to your judgment and your conscience; that it is the Church of your choice and of your affection; that you are able with confidence and comfort to worship in its words, to minister in its offices, and to teach in its spirit.' These words, though not directly referring to this measure, admit the principle. More explicit was the late Dean Milman before the Clerical Subscription Commission of 1865. He expressed his 'deep and deliberate conviction that such subscription is altogether unnecessary as a safeguard for the essential doctrines of Christianity'; moved that the *use* of the liturgy be the doctrinal test for clergymen, 'conformity to the liturgy of the Church of England being the best and surest attainable security for the declared agreement of the clergy with the doctrines of the Church'; after speaking of clergymen forced 'to act under the paralysing torture of doubt, and to subscribe at last with a trembling and reluctant hand,' asked, 'What clergyman has not felt some uneasiness under such a trial? Is it necessary that he should be subject to such uneasiness?' 'It may be asked,' said the late Dean Stanley a few months before his

death, 'whether this remnant of subscription which is left is still worth keeping. My answer is that this depends simply on the question whether it keeps a single member of the Church of England from entering the ministry. . . . It is evident that if, from whatever cause, this failure [of candidates for Ordination] should continue and extend, then it is the duty of every one to inquire into the causes; and if of these causes one should be the small shred of subscription that remains, then every man who cares for the welfare of the Church, especially when the removal of the obstacle is in accordance with a principle already fully established, should spare no endeavour to abolish it.'

After advocacy such as this, it would be impertinent in the present writer to plead for the reform. His simpler object is shortly to state—what is within his own experience—doubts and difficulties that embarrass young men in this matter. He has merely tried in a few words to set down troubles, convictions, hopes which dwell in younger minds to-day. He trusts that in doing this there is no presumption, no disrespect; that older and wiser Churchmen will bear with him where he is right, will pardon him where he is wrong.

16 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

POSTSCRIPT

Since the above paper was written (more than two years ago) the writer has learned, from published utterances of the highest ecclesiastical authorities,¹ that he can honestly take Orders in the Church of England; that the rulers of that Society acknowledge and approve his mental attitude, a suspension of judgment, towards certain great questions of natural science and Biblical criticism.

This hardly affects the use of the paper. Its object is to state a difficulty—the difficulty of ascertaining, as to certain modern theories, the comprehensiveness of the English Church; the difficulty of finding out what, in these respects, the Church of England *means*. That difficulty remains. The fact that one man, more or less, has solved it does not alter the

¹ These ecclesiastical authorities were mainly: (1) Dr. Benson, consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in 1883, who by presiding, when Bishop of Truro, at a lecture delivered in the west of England by the Rev. J. M. Wilson, then Headmaster of Clifton College, appeared to sanction the Liberal claims of that lecture (which had but lately come into my hands) for the English Church; (2) Dr. Temple, who had long stood for ecclesiastical Liberalism and had recently, early in the year 1885, received high official approval by translation from the see of Exeter to the see of London; (3) Dean Stanley, the protagonist of Anglican Liberalism, who, since his death in 1881, had acquired an added respect and authority (Note, 1914).

WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN 17

case. The paper expresses that one man's seven years' hesitation and bewilderment; it is believed to some extent to express other men's like, but unsolved, perplexities.

The difficulty affects classes much wider than candidates for Ordination. 'I need not shrink from saying,' writes the Archbishop of Canterbury, 'that I have often gone over the pages of some anti-Christian journal with care, and failed utterly to find one of the assailed beliefs really understood. There was not what I (or any Christian I know) believed, but what some (probably honest) persons imagine we believe.' Do not these misapprehensions arise because the scientific and historical latitude of the English Church is only as it were privately permitted, and not authoritatively and formally avowed? For that Church there seems to be a free unwritten constitution growing up around the constitution written and fettered. The Articles of Belief are brought into touch with the cultured consciousness of to-day, and are regenerated in the process. But the larger spirit is latent; what is patent is the restriction. What a grand thing it would be, if a young man may say so, what a gain for the elucidation and extension of English Chris-

18 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

tianity, if it were made clear, if it were made unmistakable, that the mind of the English Church is open upon many stirring questions of science and history ; if it were made manifest that our Faith, while it is substantially indicated in our inherited Creeds, is yet greater than men guess, is ' catholic,' is all-enclosing, finds within its vast circumference for every established fact, for each new truth, a proper place.

A minor object of the above paper is, as regards candidates for Ordination, to notice a remedy for the stated difficulty. It is one—I think the best—among other remedies. Whether it would be required may be doubted, if the Church of England were authoritatively to pronounce that freedom which is practically allowed. The main object of the paper, however, is not to supply a remedy ; that demands large knowledge and wide experience. The main object, which is free from those conditions, is to state a difficulty.

H. H.

April 1885.

WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN 19

APPENDIX TO I

The following letters reveal four notable opinions, held a generation ago, on the conditions of clerical veracity :

*From the Rev. Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College,
Oxford*

LINCOLN COLLEGE,
OXFORD, 24 Feb. 1876.

DEAR HANDLEY,—The question you put to me is one which it is not possible to answer satisfactorily by letter. It requires many words, and a mutual understanding upon preliminary points, which can only be carried out in conversation.

I can only say on this sheet of paper, that there are two fixed principles, which I should lay down, within which the argument must move.

1. A man must not put his hand to what he thinks untrue.

2. In joining any large association, general consent is all that can be expected.

These two positions are, I think, the opposite poles between which a man has to find his own standing ground. Probably no two men stand on exactly the same square inch of ground.

Are you likely to be in Oxford soon ? If so, I should be glad to talk the matter over with you. But you see that it is far beyond the limits of a letter.—Yours very truly,

MARK PATTISON.

From Dr. James Fraser, Bishop of Manchester

This letter was marked 'Private,' which bar was intended to prohibit publicity at the time. There can

20 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

be no doubt that the restriction, by the lapse of many years, is annulled.

BISHOP'S COURT,
MANCHESTER, Dec. 8, 1876.

DEAR SIR,—I do not see how, in your present state of mind, you could comfortably take orders in the Church of England.

No one is more grieved than I to find persons, who accept the moral and spiritual teachings of Christianity and in this sense desire to take part in the Church's work, staggered by speculative difficulties.

Have you read the arguments in favour of miracles? not merely such books as Butler, Mozley, and Mansel, but a scientific book like *The Unseen Universe*, the authors of which stand in the front rank of men of science, and who admit that science, as such, has no a priori objection to offer to the possibility of miracles. There is also much that is relevant in the last sixty or eighty pages of Professor Stanley Jevons' *Principles of Science*.

Mr. Matthew Arnold in his jaunty way disposes of the Resurrection of Christ, by simply saying that it never took place, and all that it meant was the revival of His Cause. I can merely reply that, upon that hypothesis, the fact of Christianity, as we know it—the fact of St. Paul—become the most inexplicable phenomena in the world.

There was a remarkable article on Miracles, six months since, in the *Church Quarterly Review*.

There would be no kindness in my recommending you to place yourself in what I feel would be a false and untenable position.—I remain, yours faithfully and sympathetically,

J. MANCHESTER.

H. HANDLEY, Esq.

*From the Rev. John Tulloch, Principal of the College of
St. Mary, in the University of St. Andrews*

The writer of the present volume had been moved

WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN 21

more or less from childhood to be ordained. In the year 1877 he believed himself in his opinions to be conscientiously precluded from the Ministry of the Church of England—the Church of his own native and indestructible attachment. So eager and active, however, was his desire to enter the Christian Ministry that his thoughts turned to the strange and (to him) little known Church of Scotland, and he inquired of Principal Tulloch whether, though shut out from the Anglican Ministry, he might possibly be eligible for Scotch Presbyterian Orders. To that inquiry the following letter is the reply :

ATHENÆUM CLUB,
PALL MALL, S.W., *May 5th*, 1877.

SIR,—I have your letter of the 2nd—forwarded to me here. I should have been glad to promote your views towards the Scotch Church. But, apart from other considerations, no person can be admitted to either the Free Church or the Established Church of Scotland without a long course of study at the Scotch Universities and at one or other of the Scotch Divinity Halls. You must study three years at least in the *Faculty of Arts* before you can *enter upon* the study of Divinity. During this time your views would probably undergo so much change—one way or another—that it is unnecessary for me to speak of their bearing on the Ministry of the Scotch Church : only I may say that a Candidate for this Ministry would not *confessedly suspend* his judgment on the Gospel Miracles.—Believe me, yours truly,

JOHN TULLOCH.

H. HANDLEY, Esq.

From Thomas Carlyle (dictated)

Not only a speculative difficulty, but also a practical, a domestic difficulty for the time being, appeared to

22 WHY MEN WILL NOT BE CLERGYMEN

block the way for the present writer into the Anglican Ministry. It was on the practical trouble that he ventured to consult his then great hero and teacher, Mr. Carlyle. Incidentally Mr. Carlyle, for whom the writer retains a deep and unbroken reverence, in his reply notices adversely the position of an Anglican clergyman, and the letter, therefore, is here published as bearing on the subject of clerical veracity.

5 CHEYNE ROW,
CHELSEA, 13 *Feb.* 1876.

SIR,—Mr. Carlyle bids me say that he read your letter with much interest. He thinks you have made the right choice, considering the circumstances. Even apart from these he thinks that a really good and truthful man, in the present state of things, might easily grow to consider the position of a clergyman of the Church of England very far from an enviable or ideal one. Mr. Carlyle says that much of good and true and pious is possible for an earnest man in every profession (perhaps in several a good deal more easily possible than in the clerical at present). He would have you loyally and hopefully abide by the choice, which the best of motives has prompted you to make.

With Mr. Carlyle's cordial good wishes for your prosperity, in the best sense of the word.—I am, yours truly,
MARY CARLYLE AITKEN.

The present writer believes that, since these four distinguished men pronounced their judgment, the growth of knowledge has compelled, and the Christian conscience is conceding, a larger freedom for the clergy. This wider liberty is vindicated in four of the succeeding essays.

II

THE BASES OF MODERNIST
PREVALENCE¹(The *Nineteenth Century and After*, June 1905)

‘After all, while we are disputing about these matters of relatively small importance, there are vast questions, lying at the root of all religion, which are being called in doubt from day to day by those very far removed from the plane of controversy on which we are so unfortunately forced to dwell. Those questions press heavily upon a large body of the earnest laity of this country, and I am convinced that no greater injury can be done to the cause of religion than to see so many ministers of religion apparently absorbed [in], and prepared to sacrifice everything to, matters which, compared with the subjects to which I have referred, are almost as nothing in the balance. I find it almost impossible to express adequately the strength of my feeling on this subject. There is not merely an injury, perhaps an irreparable injury, being done to the fabric

¹ This, or something like it, was the original title of the following essay. For a transitory purpose the title, on publication in the *Nineteenth Century and After*, was changed to the awkward substitute, ‘Anglican Starvation and a Liberal Diet.’ The original heading, more apt, indicative, and euphonic, is now resumed (Note, 1914).

24 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

of the Church of England, but there is an injury being done to the whole cause of religion.'

THE RIGHT HON. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

House of Commons, the 11th of April 1899.

I. IN the eighteenth century the Evangelicals prevailed. Mr. Lecky, whose History is an unruffled reflection of that age on the waters of memory, shows to us the Evangelicals, and them only among religious groups, in large lineament and sharp detail. He spends one out of his twenty-one chapters on 'The Religious Revival.' And at the end of his work, looking back, he writes of 'The Evangelical Party' thus: 'Nearly all the popular religious literature of the time, nearly every fresh departure, nearly every new organisation which grew up in the English religious world, was mainly due to it.'

The Evangelicals deserved their prevalence. They had hold of the primary and living secret—personal religion—and they worked it out in exalted character and noble activities. It is their piety which tells. It may be seen, narrowing our vision within the lines of the English Church, as clearly, perhaps, as anywhere in the life of William Wilberforce. 'He rose soon after seven, spent the first hour and

a half in his closet.' 'His own mind,' his sons in their biography go on to say, 'was quiet in the storm' of political encounter. 'The next day's diary affords a glimpse of those deep waters which no political tempests could disturb: "Walked from Hyde Park Corner, repeating the 119th Psalm, in great comfort."' And so it is with them all. Lord Dartmouth asks Fletcher of Madeley whether any preferment would be welcome to him. Not many persons could, without sleekness and affectation, make his well-known reply: 'I want nothing but more grace.' The fragments of their devotions which successive tides of approval have washed up on to the shores of permanence evince the same rare spiritual quality: 'Rock of Ages,' 'Hark, my soul!' 'How sweet the Name,' etc.

Yet grave and disabling defects in the Evangelical position, when it is measured according to the proportion of the faith and is put to the test of wide experiment, incontestably there were. The English religious experience of the next century found these out. It affirmed the Evangelical shortcoming. It conceived the High Church remedy. The whole Oxford Movement was directed to supplement

26 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

the Evangelical verities, to repair the breaks in the Protestant walls, to achieve Catholic entirety.

II. In the nineteenth century the High Churchmen gradually prevailed. They prevail now. They, too, in their turn, merited ascendancy and control. They had hold of an inherent and momentous secret of Christianity—sacramental religion; the fact of a visible society from first to last, the City of God on earth, the kingdom. They saw the corporate, fraternal aspect; the elect knit together by mystic, holy, indissoluble bonds, across all time and space, across the river of death, in one communion and fellowship. Great personalities, great virtues established the Tractarian pre-eminence. The leaders were men of genius, men of sanctity, men who wrestled in prayer. *Character* was at the bottom of the upheaval. ‘Even more than a theological reform,’ writes Dean Church, ‘it was a protest against the loose unreality of ordinary religious morality.’ The fire spread; the fire of this purity and enthusiasm spread from leaders to followers, from the central academic world to scattered town and country vicarages, to refined Christian homes about the land; and

once more, as in every religious revival, men began to see, and with awe to own, fresh rays from the Light which no man can approach unto. Ah! the movement was unworldly then. There was austerity, simplicity, the soaring of the saints of God. Newman can tell us about it, can sound these high notes for us with ease :

The world sweeps by in long procession : its principalities and powers, the horse and its rider and the chariots of Egypt, Baal and Ashtoreth and their false worship ; and those who witness feel its fascination ; they flock after it ; with a strange fancy they ape its gestures and dote upon its mummeries ; and then, should they perchance fall in with the simple and solemn services of Christ's Church, and hear her witnesses going the round of Gospel truths as when they left them : ' I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life ' ; ' Be sober, be vigilant ' ; ' Strait is the gate, narrow the way ' ; ' If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself ' ; ' He is despised and rejected of men, a Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,' how utterly unreal do these appear, and the preachers of them how irrational, how puerile ! how extravagant in their opinions, how weak in their reasoning ! And if they profess to pity and bear with them, how nearly does their compassion border on contempt ! The contempt of men !—why should we be unwilling to endure it ?

High Churchmen of these latter days have

28 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

not been dull to recognise the magnitude of the Oxford Movement, or to appraise the value of its accomplishment. They have investigated thoroughly the region of its superiorities. They have even been tempted here, in their estimate and discourse, to hyperbole and glorification. Where their search has not been so quick, intent, and perspicacious is in the area of Tractarian blemish and failure. Yet serious default from the first lies as a disfigurement along the fair track of this revival, and High Churchmen as a party now, the third generation of their order, are not exempt from the inglorious vices of success. To put these dark spots under the lens, and to have a steady look at them—this must be done. It must be done, negatively to correct the partiality of blind, immoderate encomium, positively for warning and profit. To the present writer, reared from childhood in a High Anglican atmosphere, whose holy fragrance will last to him for ever, the task is uncongenial. It is attempted, not readily, in the interests of contrition and truth.

(1) The Anglo-Catholics, as we review their course, are, until the last decade or decade and a half (when there have been incipient

remorse and amendment), responsible for a far-reaching wrong to English religion—a wrong which, as things are, must have dragged the wheels of cultured faith; a wrong which, as things would have been but for the prescience, enterprise, fortitude of the Broad Churchmen, might in England have almost desperately widened, as in France, the breach between thought and piety. The wrong was this: the Anglo-Catholics' dislike, their suspicion of new knowledge; their impotent yet malefic efforts to check its salutary and irresistible growth. Take a few examples.

A personal reference may, perhaps, be excused, since it gives colour and point to the illustration. In the year 1878 I, like many other young Oxford men, was in the throes of religious doubt and difficulty. In particular, the question of the earthly origin of mankind puzzled and troubled me. I had made some reading acquaintance with Darwin and his expositors; I held a vague but strong conviction that the momentum of educated opinion would gradually drive Darwin's theory up on to the heights of received and accumulating truth, and that Christian theology had better come to terms with it. Writers like Maurice

30 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

and Kingsley seemed to have prepared the way for this conciliation. Dean Stanley had lately preached a University sermon of large outlook and wide theological sweep, designed to take in the new anthropological doctrine without strain or discontinuity. But Pusey was the head of a section of Churchmen which, to me, carried great authority. He preached upon the subject this year before the University. More precisely, being ill himself, his sermon was read for him by Canon Liddon. It was soon published, under the rather awkward title *Un-Science, Not Science, Adverse to Faith*. It was largely a repudiation of Darwin's view of the 'descent of man.' A final note was added to the printed sermon thus :

I have been asked, in the name of some young members of the University who heard this sermon, whether I account the *animal* derivation of the *body* of man to be a theory contradictory to revelation. . . . My answer, then, to my young friends is this : 'It lies at the basis of our faith that man was created in the perfection of our nature, endowed with supernatural grace, with a full freedom of choice, such as man, until restored by Christ, has not had since. . . . That "mythological" part of Darwinism, not resting on *certain* facts, cannot become matter of science.'

I shall never forget the sick feeling with

which I read that pronouncement. It suffocated one's hopes. It was an ultimatum, on the part of the Church, to a foe which already wore the unmistakable mien of victory. It was one more of those strange, waste endeavours to put the clock back. You can put your own clock back ; but that does not alter the time of day, it merely makes you late. And here the ecclesiastical clock was to be set hours behind the intellectual clock. The clock of St. Paul's Cathedral was to be placed in false and hopeless conflict with the clock of the Royal Society. Here one's religion, one's Church, the things one held deep and dear, were to be committed to a probably defenceless and untenable position, were to be staked on a hazard or tied to a fallacy. And that life's dream of Holy Orders ? That old, haunting summons to the ministry ? If you are to obey its august bidding, must you thus decide for yourself adversely, dogmatically, finally, and beforehand these inchoate and immense problems of benign natural knowledge ? Very well, then ; never !

There is, alas ! no idiosyncrasy, no caprice in this attitude of the revered leader, Dr. Pusey. It consists with the lamentable tradition of

32 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

his party. Within the Anglo-Catholic camp smouldered for two generations the quiet fires, burning with a red, restrained glow, of hostility to new knowledge. Sometimes they broke out in a flash of energetic antagonism. Such a flash (at Oxford, too) was the notorious assault of Bishop Wilberforce on Professor Huxley, on the 30th of June 1860, when the aggressor condescended to certain ill-informed raillery in unsurpassable bad taste, the Churchman comparing poorly, in both dignity and truth, with the savant. Similarly, a generation earlier, those dull fires shot out in the following small, preliminary, and incentive flame. The British Association met at Oxford in 1832. Upon four of its distinguished members — Brewster, Faraday, Brown, and Dalton—the University conferred the honorary degree of D.C.L. Keble's comment in a private letter was this: 'He [Keble] was angry at the "temper and tone of the Oxford doctors"; they had "truckled sadly to the spirit of the times" in receiving "the hodge-podge of philosophers," as they did.' ¹

As with natural science, so is it with historical criticism. The High Churchmen hated it.

¹ Liddon's *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*.

BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE 33

Observe their treatment of *Essays and Reviews*. In that famous volume there may have been some infelicity of judgment and of statement on doubtful questions of Biblical science, but the writers were groping in the right direction. Study the High Anglican attacks upon them; the wild, helter-skelter shooting in the air, the resounding and falsified invective. Several pages of the catalogue of the Library in the British Museum are filled with vehement, forgotten controversy on this assailing side. Out of the long array of bellicose books or pamphlets, perhaps the most important was *Replies to 'Essays and Reviews,'* by the Revs. E. M. Goulburn (later Dean of Norwich), H. J. Rose, C. A. Heurtley (Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford), W. J. Irons, G. Rorison, A. W. Haddan, Christopher Wordsworth (later Bishop of Lincoln), with a preface by the Lord Bishop (Wilberforce) of Oxford, published in 1862. Take short extracts from the two respective leading replies—by Mr. Goulburn and Mr. Wordsworth—to the two respective leading essays of Dr. Temple (later Archbishop of Canterbury) and of Professor Jowett.

First, however, let us pin up for inspection

34 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

the dramatic and disproved warning of the episcopal preface. Bishop Wilberforce wrote :

More true is the explanation [of the far-reaching causes of the volume *Essays and Reviews*] which sees in it the first stealing over the sky of the lurid lights which shall be shed profusely around the great Antichrist.

Then follows, in the line of indiscreet succession, Mr. Goulburn's appreciation of Dr. Temple's essay on 'The Education of the World.' This essay was conceived after the pattern of Lessing's classical treatise on 'The Education of the Human Race,' and was in wise and anticipative harmony with the gathering results of anthropological science, such as since have been harvested in the works, say, of Dr. E. B. Tylor. Note Mr. Goulburn's reply to some contention of Dr. Temple concerning the progress of civilisation. This is it :

What has the mere cultivation of taste to do with the very serious subject on which we are engaged, 'God's education of the human race' ? . . . Are not civilisation and the progress of the Church somewhat sharply distinguished in Scripture ? which surely is a sign that the two should be kept asunder as separate subjects of thought. We commend to Dr. Temple's notice the pregnant fact that in the earliest history of mankind it is stated that *arts, both ornamental and*

BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE 35

useful (and arts are the great medium of civilisation), *took their rise in the family of Cain*. In the line of Seth we find none of this mental and social development.

It is no reply. It is no argument. It is a batch of remarks, of cries, reaching us from a traveller who has dropped far behind along the mental road, and who naturally sees the landscape at an angle different from that of pioneers on the journey.

Mr. Wordsworth replies, with the same backward and amazing inability, to Professor Jowett. Jowett had written :

They [the Gospels] are for the most part of *common origin*.

Wordsworth answers :

Here he [Jowett] has revived the obsolete theory, of which German scholars have long since been ashamed, that the Gospels are from some common original [mark the inaccuracy of quotation]. . . . A century ago this notion . . . was rightly discarded as chimerical and ridiculous by J. G. Rosenmüller. . . . And the Essayist now, in the middle of the nineteenth century, has disinterred that theory from its grave, where it has slept for some time ; he would galvanise into life this crazy skeleton.

Jowett had written :

The time will come when educated men will be no more able to believe that the words, ' Out of Egypt

36 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

have I called my Son,' were *intended by the prophet* to refer to the return of Joseph and Mary out of Egypt.

Wordsworth answers :

In contemplating such reasoning we are lost in astonishment. The vanity and conceit of the human heart is indeed great, and scarcely any common exhibition of it ought to cause much surprise. But surely this is a phenomenon almost unparalleled. The Essayist correcting the Evangelist ! . . . The Essayist correcting the Holy Ghost !

And so it is over and again over ¹—bad advice ; false vaticination ; incognisance of imminent developments ; blindness to the vital ; insistence on the moribund ; sustained and unrepentant indocility.² These guides would have led the English people religiously astray, into intellectual bypaths of regress, gloom, and dead-lock.

(2) A certain effeminacy has crept into the clerical type ; has crept in during the High Anglican transformation, and bears usually the High Anglican stamp. It is an insurmountable barrier to the respect of Englishmen. The English are a manly race. The

¹ The gifted and saintly Canon Liddon, by his treatment of *Lux Mundi*, led in later years this same defiance of the light.

² If these prophets were right, Christianity died during about the last thirty years of the nineteenth century ; for notions averred by them to be *sine quibus non* of the faith were, in that period, generally and conclusively abjured.

ministers of Christ in English history have for the most part been a manly breed—St. Cuthbert, Stephen Langton, Hugh Latimer, Jeremy Taylor, Robert South, Thomas Arnold ; these are eminent and representative, they are robust and masculine characters. And so it has been generally with the rank and file. Montalembert pays his fine tribute to the virility of the English Church, and, by implication, to its virile ministry :

Satisfied with having deposited in these brave hearts the secrets of eternity, the rules of moral life, and strength to struggle against the corruption of every man born of woman, they [the early monastic missionaries] left intact the spirit of the race, so that underneath his Christian vestment the old Teuton still stood perfect and complete. . . . It is the soul, the glorious and manful soul, of the converted Saxon which reveals itself in the modern Englishman.

Turn now to that new and most weak development of the clerical person—the effeminate and affected type, familiar, it is feared, to most readers, and illustrated below from the extravagance of caricature. Caricature magnifies. But faults which the public eye recognises in the isolation and enlargement of caricature certainly exist—reduced, diffused, and complicated—in actuality.

38 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

(a) *The Private Secretary* was a popular farce. The dramatic critic of the *Times* says that it was vulgar and clumsy. That may be. But for us the fact to note is that the play was a favourite. The Rev. Robert Spalding was *recognised*. Tens of thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands, of playgoers knew him. They themselves had known Rev. Robert Spaldings in private life; and they, by their presence and enjoyment, did innumera- bly countersign the affirmation of the piece that such clergymen were alive. The Rev. Robert Spalding is not the kind of ecclesiastic which our age requires. Wisdom, speaking in the Book of Proverbs, proclaims: *I have strength*. The Rev. Robert Spalding has not strength. It is hard to imagine a personage less likely to make Felix tremble. And there are few less satisfactory dramatic figures than this foolish representative, with his goloshes and bun, of an incomparably high calling.

(b) Mr. Albert Chevalier is a refined and subtle delineator of common types of character. He exhibits, with an acute insight, and sometimes with a moving pathos, various classes of men in their distinctive aspects, virtues, innocuous frailties: the coster, the old rustic,

the old bachelor, the worn-out vocalist, etc. He loves his creations and suffuses them, even in their weaknesses, with a sympathy which, infecting his hearers, makes portrait after portrait appear lovable. Once he allows himself to portray an utter ass, and it is a parson. A curate at a parochial bazaar gives a lecture on 'Mary had a little Lamb.' It is very clever mimicry; point after point—in sing-song, in tricks of voice, in mannerisms, in artificial gesture, in all-round native and acquired unwisdom—is made, and is instantly caught by a tickled and rejoicing audience. That body of watching and listening Englishmen and Englishwomen have often endured in real life those clerical foibles now being held up to their disdain in the mirror of the actor's talent. They know; they clap; they approve:

You yourself [said Grattan, addressing the English people] are the great anomaly. The Continent lay flat before your late rival; the Spaniard had retired; the Austrian had retired; the Prussian had retired; the iron quality of Russia had dissolved; the domination of France had come to the water's edge, when, behold! from a misty speck in the west the avenging genius of these countries issues forth, clutching ten thousand thunders, breaks the spell of France, stops, in his own person, the flying fortunes of the world,

40 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

sweeps the sea, rights the globe, and then retires in a frame of glory, and . . . the human race is in amaze and admiration.

Many things are uncertain in the future of our English religion. A few things are certain. Here is one of them: that this same English race will not be influenced religiously by sermons which, as an average audience perceives, are akin to feeble mincings about 'Mary had a little Lamb.'

(3) A connected High Church blemish is the observed paucity of men in ordinary High Church congregations. No more competent nor more just judge could speak the weighty word on this masculine failure than Mr. Charles Booth. This is what, in his monumental work concerning the religious influences of London, he writes :

The men who find satisfaction for their religious nature in the High Church are of a quite peculiar type. I cannot think it a strong type, and the idea that on these lines the world of men could ever be won is utterly untenable. If all those who reject this road will be lost, then will most of us inevitably suffer that fate. The influence exercised on the male sex is indeed strong, but is very limited. With women it is more diffused, and with children it reaches its greatest numerical success.

(4) The same judicial and expert investigator

appears to lay at the door of the Church, especially of the High Church party, exceeding responsibility for the 'discomforts,' the 'bitterness of feeling,' the 'little co-operation' which disgrace the relations between Anglicanism and Nonconformity.

(5) The High Churchmen have been, within clearly marked limits, successful; and they know it. Indeed, some of them are more conscious of the success than of the limits. And with many of them has followed that shadow to the sunlight of prosperity—self-esteem. They display what the adult, in his dull, prosy way, calls 'conceit'; what the boy, with his genius for expository and adhesive epithet, calls 'side.' A few examples may light up this indictment.

(a) An incumbent of moderate views lately, with entire politeness, offered his senior curacy to one of the assistant clergy, an extreme High Churchman, who was about to leave a neighbouring parish. He received the following response:

DEAR MR. ———,—There is no chance of my coming to St. ———'s; for, when I leave my present sphere of work, I shall move to a more advanced church.—Yours faithfully,
A.¹

¹ This letter is quoted from memory, but its substantial accuracy is certain.

42 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

‘ More advanced ’ here meant, it is believed, more advanced in ritual ; not, where the need was, in courtesy. But the letter showed how, in the excitement of sacerdotal progress, it is possible to combine the part of a very earnest parish priest with the part of a very ill-mannered young man. This case was private, though the names could be privately divulged. The next case shall be public.

(b) On the 15th July 1898 the Rev. the Hon. James Adderley, then aged thirty-seven, wrote the following letter to the *Times* :

SIR,—Having been through just the same experience as Lady Wimborne when I was a boy at Oxford, and having by the grace of God emerged a loyal Catholic of the Church of England, I feel for her Ladyship most sincerely, and hope she may have the same good fortune as myself. She says she is convinced that the doctrines of the Church of England cannot be taught by a clergyman who has a High Celebration with Catholic ritual. So I used to think ; but I found I was mistaken. I had never read any theology in those days ; I had only glanced at my Prayer-book ; I knew nothing of the Ornaments Rubric, the Act of Uniformity, the Tractarian movement, etc. Consequently I bore false witness against my neighbours—viz. the Ritualistic clergy. But when God revealed the truth to me, and I understood what conversion meant, and what the Incarnation, the

Catholic Church, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Real Presence, Confession and Absolution, and all the rest meant, then a new light dawned on my soul, and I found a beautiful peace in the Church of England. . . .

There is no reason to suppose that, in ordinary circumstances, this controversialist would have treated a lady otherwise than with that deference and urbanity which are her due. But Mr. Adderley, slightly inflated with High Church glory, in effect tells Lady Wimborne that she is as ignorant as he was when a boy; that she has yet to learn the A B C of theology, 'the Ornaments Rubric,' 'and all the rest'; that, for himself, the truth has been divinely revealed to him—his dark, vacant, and Evangelical childhood breaking into the luminous and Catholic manhood which we see. Thus are the mounting encouragements of Mr. Adderley's autobiography unrolled before our eyes; and thus, probably, is Lady Wimborne confirmed in her distaste for Ritualists and all their ways.

(c) This Catholic pertness has often discredited the High Anglican press. Within the soul of one well-known newspaper are visible the seven spirits of sauciness hard at work; and by its pervading disrespect for bishops of the wrong colour, by its jaunty nescience of the profound

44 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

religious problems and difficulties which are knocking and clamouring at our gates, by its smartness and impenitence, its conscious infallibility and its unconscious ridiculousness, a file of that newspaper is a useful register of the particular High Church moral demerit now under consideration.

‘Nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice.’ We have been telling to High Churchmen, especially to High Church clergy, a few home truths. We have been diagnosing their malady. Their default is serious¹; to themselves it induces debility, and threatens collapse; if it be not cured it will become a peril, as now it is an impoverishment, of English Christianity. But we will not leave them in tones of monition and ingratitude. They still have their heroic quality. In out-of-the-way corners of our land, in the

¹ The High Church party have dominated the English Church for a generation; they have had their chance. The numerical verdict on their ascendancy is found in the recent religious census of London published in the *Daily News*, and in some consequent instructive calculations. During the last seventeen years, while the population of London has increased by some 500,000, the attendance at public worship is alleged to have decreased by some 150,000; the subtraction apparently being made hardly at all from the Nonconformist numbers, but almost entirely from the numbers of the National Church. The *Guardian* (29th July 1903), assuming the accuracy of the figures, thus concludes: ‘In the Church of England there are only three worshippers in 1903 for every four in 1886.’

streets and lanes of our great cities, where squalor is, and ferocity and despair, amid hissing temptations and broken-hearted degradations, in the dark, awful caverns of mortality—there the more earnest High Church clergy, looking for nothing again, do bear the heavenly light. You can look into their eyes and see it: it is the Light of the World.

Light on the brow
 Of the Hill of Time ;
 What Light art Thou
 Whither all men now
 Turn eyes, and climb ?
 We crave Thee, we cry for Thee,
 We faint, and we sigh for Thee ;
 Thou shinest above ;
 Yea, we dare die for Thee—
 Light that art Love.

III. In the twentieth century the Broad Churchmen must prevail. Why must they prevail? Because the Church is starving; and they, in the actual circumstances, alone can provide the restorative and necessary food. The strict High Church diet is proved to be insufficient. Insufficient the strict Low Church diet was long ago proved to be. Certain nutritive substances, enriching the older regimen, are indispensable to recovery, and are found only in the Liberal granaries.

46 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

Evidently an important question is this: What are these Liberal and nutritive substances? For a complete reply there are needed in the respondent uncommon qualifications — philosophical, theological, historical competence. Working clergy in poor parishes of London, untravelled along the high curricula of learning, lack this rare proficiency and information; their answer loses accordingly. Yet the men of practice have their humble uses. Therefore the present writer, after nineteen years of close and inquiring ministerial converse with many educated and many uneducated men who, amid their unlikenesses, were alike in puzzled dissatisfaction with our present ecclesiastical Christianity—the present writer ventures to enumerate, for what they are worth, the following five Liberal principles as the life-giving aliment which will save our Church from invalidity and decline.

(1) *Spiritual experience* is the basis of Christian beliefs. The structure of Christian doctrine rests, with all its weight, on the interior experience of Christendom—continuous, varying, progressive. St. Peter had known, in some deep and unseen region of his being, moving and crucial experiences before he fetched up to the

surface and exhibited before the eyes of men his great confession: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' In the spacious depths of the soul of St. Paul there had been hidden mighty workings, conflicts, triumphs, before their effects could be reported in terms of the intelligence thus: 'That life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God.' For centuries the souls of nations had been stirred and swayed and drawn in their inmost recesses towards the Church, before mediæval and papal Rome, through Hildebert of Le Mans, could mould in human language her proud tenet: 'It was to Cæsars, consuls, orators that I once owed the conquest of the earth;' but by the Cross alone have I made the conquest of heaven.' For centuries, again, the souls of nations had later felt, deep down within, suspicion, resentment, disgust, before Article XIX. of the Church of England, putting into verbal shape those vast, shapeless aversions, could utter this decisive profession: 'So also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.' Once more, the spiritual origin and support of another great doctrine has been propounded

48 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

thus: 'Christian *experience* is Trinitarian; the eternal verities and the practical sanctities have reached the consciousness of Christendom so; the Arian or Unitarian effort turns *down* the light—the vision is paler, God recedes.'¹ Spiritual experience, therefore, is the invisible foundation of Christian beliefs. Theological statements and theological systems have been endeavours to register in terms of intellect that interior and underlying experience of Christendom so far as, at the time, the experience has gone. Creeds are placards of the mind, exposed to view in the busy thoroughfares of the understanding, announcing the mystic events of the soul of the Christian society in its secret and ultimate profundities.²

Theological assertions, to be apt and valid, must grow with the growth of that spiritual experience whose verdicts they adumbrate and summarise; must move with its animation.³

¹ Several phrases here are borrowed from the Rev. R. F. Horton.

² Note, as strengthening the argument, the weird territory of the sub-conscious world, in exploration of which the late Mr. F. W. H. Myers was pioneer, and disciplined thinkers, such as are Professor William James of Harvard and Sir Oliver Lodge, now lead the reinforcements. [Professor James died, amid deep and wide regret, in 1910—Note, 1914.]

³ Signs of the times are attempts such as these: (1) *Revised Catechism*, being an Examination and Revision of the Westminster

For Christendom is alive. It has, indeed, its sacrosanct and incomparable memories, its immense and hallowed store of past spiritual experience. But it has, too, its throbbing, living spiritual experience in the present—deepening, widening, waxing. This living spiritual experience of to-day partly corroborates that past spiritual experience of yesterday—so far the experience of yesterday survives; this living spiritual experience of to-day partly modifies, corrects, abandons, augments, develops that past spiritual experience of yesterday—so far the experience of yesterday alters or drops away; and theology, the small intellectual reflex of the huge spiritual perceptions, is subject to the same law of waste and repair, of desuetude, continuance, and increase. The law is manifest in other spheres of human advancement. In the great tracts of natural science the scientific experience of bygone generations obtains now just so far, and so far only, as the scientific experience of to-day endorses it. The estimates of Newton, of

Assembly's *Shorter Catechism*, by the Rev. Duff Macdonald, Minister of South Dalziel Parish, Motherwell, with a Preface by Professor Robert Flint; published by A. & C. Black. (2) The avowed propensity of the Anglican Convocations, in 1904 and 1905, to mitigate or to abandon recital in public worship of the *Quicunque Vult*.

50 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

Linnæus, of Lavoisier, are partly discarded, partly retained, partly amplified; that is, they hold good only so far as contemporary scientific judgment confirms them. So the theological estimates based on then accumulated spiritual experience—of St. Augustine or St. Anselm, of Wyclif or Hooker—are partly discarded, partly retained, partly amplified; that is, they hold good only so far as present theological judgment, based on now accumulated spiritual experience, confirms them.

It is objected: But the spiritual experience, and therefore the theological expressions of Christendom, are, and have been, various, irregular, uneven, self-contradictory, internecine; how, from such a medley of warring and refractory ingredients, can you elicit the peaceful affirmations of a common creed? The answer is: Amid all spiritual vicissitude, amid the ecclesiastical and confessional hurly-burly, there has been, and is, tendency, drift, design; through the long sequence of Church discords may be heard an inner harmony; there is in the Christian brotherhood an inmost interpretation of the divine presented objects, a spiritual experience which is the same to-day as it was yesterday, and will be to-morrow—

this, when articulated, and this only, is the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints.

This Broad Church principle—that spiritual experience is the basis of Christian beliefs—has been borrowed from a distinguished German school of theology. It has been intimated, with admirable point and lucidity, in the often-quoted epigram of Amiel: ‘*Le déplacement du christianisme de la région historique dans la région psychologique est le vœu de notre époque.*’ It has been expressed as follows, even more appositely for our purpose, by the Rev. W. R. Inge,¹ the Bampton Lecturer on Mysticism, one of the younger Oxford thinkers likely to impress the English Church :

The greatest need seems to be that we should return to the fundamentals of spiritual religion. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that both the old seats of authority, the infallible Church and the infallible Book, are fiercely assailed, and that our faith needs reinforcements. These can only come from the depths of the religious consciousness itself ; and if summoned from thence, they will not be found wanting. The ‘impregnable rock’ is neither an institution nor a book, but a life or experience.

¹ Now Dean of St. Paul’s (Note, 1914).

52 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

The principle, amid the tremors of Christians for their belief, restores confidence. Spiritual experience is that which draws nearest to God and makes most for righteousness. If, in our or other times, the whole of the contemporary belief is sustained by contemporary spiritual experience, the whole belief is healthy and secure; the vital sap from the ground flows into all its branches. If, on the other hand, part of the contemporary belief, or if any particular interpretation of a part, is not sustained by contemporary spiritual experience, that part, or that interpretation, has done its work and will wither¹; nothing in the long run can save it. The call to Christendom, alive now as ever, is to trust its own living consciousness, whatever this consciousness, progressively taught by the unveiling Spirit (πνεῦμα ἀποκαλύψεως, Eph. i. 17), may report. 'Sink, O Christendom, in thy soul; yearn to the greatness of the Spirit; rally the truth in the depths of thyself.'

(2) *An open mind* there must be in natural science and in history. Natural science, after years of fierce argumentative strife, has, against

¹ For instance, the minatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed are withering.

obscurant theology, on this point won the day. We Christians are willing now to learn natural science, untrammelled and direct, from natural scientists. But historical science steps forward with an equally just, commanding, and momentous pretension. It claims for itself, for its own unreserved and undisputed investigation, the whole realm of history, and it calls upon theology, as a judge in this domain, to retire. We Christians have only partly yielded here ; we are still screening off certain sacred areas of the past, which we desire to protect from that brilliant and discovering searchlight of the historians. Professor Pfeiderer writes concerning Bishop Gore's essay in *Lux Mundi* : ' With these concessions to the criticism of the Old Testament the author cannot, of course, escape the natural question, Why, if so much development is admitted in the Old Testament, the same is not to be admitted in the New ? '

What happened in the past ? Who will tell us ? Will Church authority ? Tradition ? Decrees of Councils ? Opinions of ancient Fathers ? Discussions of modern clergy ? Consensus of the devout unlearned ? The way-side preacher ? The peasant on his knees ? The nun in ecstasy ? Will these tell us what

54 BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE

happened in the past ? No ! These agencies or agents all deserve our respect ; some of them deserve our reverence. But they cannot tell us what happened in the past, for they do not know ; they have not been trained to find it out. *Historical science* will tell us what happened in the past. The mass of Christian people will be told ; they will not tell. You and I will have no voice in the narration. The proper and equipped investigators are hard at work. They are surveying largely and scrutinising minutely. The ascertainable facts of our human story will not escape them ; and the facts will be marshalled and interpreted according to the verified and approved laws of human chronicles. On important points of the Christian origins the inquiring experts are not yet agreed. Until they are agreed the rest of Christendom cannot be agreed. When they are agreed they will tell the rest of Christendom the decision, and the rest of Christendom will have to accept it. Ah ! our eyes are intent on this exploring, and the heart's desire of some among us is for a conservative issue. Meanwhile, however, we must disentangle the eternal certitudes of our religion from those historical hesitations ; we must labour that

the Church of Christ, whatever restorations of its historical walls corrosive change may demand, shall, imbedded and erect on the spiritual rock, still stand in its ancient, awful, and inviolable repose.

(3) *Wide sympathies* must reign in the heart of the English Church. (a) They must break through the hard rind of exclusive Anglican temper which externally shuts out Nonconformists from appreciation and fraternity, and which internally represses surging hopes and patient prayers for reunion. (b) Nothing but sympathy can discover the great wanted service in the churches of our land—the service which shall hold and elevate, not depress and repel, the masses of the people. The Book of Common Prayer contains not such a service within its covers. Superb, sublime, the final word for the initiated, to the great untouched crowd of working-people it is irrelevant; it is not the easy and natural expression of their desires; they are without the range of its chaste and lofty diction. The imperious want, once, at least, on every Sunday in poorer parishes is of a people's service which shall be homely, pertinent, opportune, vivid; which shall engage attention, and lend wings to poor, slowly

mounting aspiration, and condescend to humble, unaccustomed minds.¹ Nothing but sympathy, penetrating with sensitive feelers into the devout needs of the heart of the multitude, can learn the secret, and inspire the forms, of this future popular worship. (c) The half-believer, the doubter, the agnostic, often of a surpassing sincerity and religious to the core—is he not to be caught in the great protective embrace of the Church’s sympathy? Is he to be allowed to deem himself an *outsider*? There are no outsiders. The circumference of the Church’s regard is the circumference of mankind.² And, in our disturbed and anxious age, the Church fails immeasurably if, while staunch to her own essential doctrines and persistent in edification of her own *fideles*, she cannot, by the enthusiasm of her humanity, the amplitude of her compassion, and the infinity of her resource, also minister with healing medicine to the innumerable company of the perplexed, and

¹ The writer has here borrowed phrases and sentences from letters of his to the *Times* on this subject in August 1898.

² It is wider, if the consideration were to the point. It comprehends, in humbler regions, man’s earthly dumb companions, *e.g.* the horse, the dog, the pigeon; in higher realms, the spirits of the blessed human departed, and the numberless ranks of unknown, but dimly apprehended, celestial beings.

cannot disclose to their dejected outlook gleams of the beatific vision. 'Et Jesus dixit illi: *Respice.*'

(4) Our religion must be *manly*. It must be womanly too. But effeminate or sickly it must not be. In the streets of Rome you may see double rows of walking, black-cassocked youths, set apart, indeed, for a lofty purpose, and often inwardly burning with the fervour of self-sacrifice, but pale, pinched, demure, unhealthy; they are pupils of the seminaries, the future priests of the Roman communion. The English race, well thinking over the matter during the three hundred years of religious change which we call the Reformation, decided not to have persons of that kind for their clergy. They decided to have persons of another kind. They are not likely to revert from that decision; they are likely to abide by it. The theological colleges which, progeny of the Oxford Movement, have lately sprung up in our land have wrought one mighty benefit for the ministry of the English Church: they have insisted on the sovereign importance of prayer, meditation, retreat. On the other hand, they are beset by one perverting temptation—the inclination towards seminary ideals and habits; the disposition to

rear as English clergy, not a body of unworldly consecrated men, who are human, companionable, domestic, but a thin, superior, implacably separate, priestly *caste*. In building up the minds and morals of English clergymen, if the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius Loyola has, no doubt, a formative value, it may be well to recollect that so also have *Tom Brown's School-days*, *Westward Ho!* or *Mr. Midshipman Easy*.

(5) Our religion must be *English*. Christianity, indeed, is universal, yet is of a most gracious particularity. It knows no distinction of sex, yet it appeals differently to the man and to the woman. It knows no distinction of learning, yet it speaks in one tongue to the educated, to the ignorant in another. It knows no distinction of race, yet it approaches the Teuton otherwise than the Latin. The universal religion will mercifully adapt itself to our English needs, as the illimitable ocean incessantly conforms itself to our English coasts. The Anglo-Saxon character is tough and conspicuous, prone to grave temptations, endued with God-given virtues, summoned the world over to strangely grand and arduous responsibilities. In spiritual things it has a native simplicity, dignity, depth, independence of its

own. It is this Anglo-Saxon soul, not another, which, by methods congenial to it and effective, the Holy Catholic Church in this land has to take and to imbue, amid the common affairs of daily life, with the purpose, strength, and glories of Christian sanctity. ‘Ars est artium regimen animarum.’

To be a Broad Church clergyman is, within the Church, at present to be unpopular.¹ The tide is against the man. The ecclesiastical powers that be are politely deterrent. His clerical comrades, High and Low, who in private life are his constant friends, exert against him in ministrations of the Church a gentle and dissuasive boycott. The position exacts a sacrifice of personal advancement. But, happily, a clergyman cannot even kneel at the sick-bed of a poor old woman and say a simple

¹ Broad Churchmen, since Maurice and Kingsley's time, have lacked organisation and union. There are but small cohering and attractive nuclei. The C.C.C., a private debating brotherhood of forty clergy, mostly Liberals, was nursed into vigour by Maurice and is thriving. The Churchmen's Union is a society for public discussion among Churchmen of rife and fundamental religious problems, and in this respect is honourably bearing the brunt of the Liberal battle. The *Modern Churchman*, edited by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, Vice-Principal of the Clergy College, Ripon, is a brave and competent monthly endeavour to further the cause with a magazine. It is the successor of the *Liberal Churchman*, founded in 1904 by the Rev. W. D. Morrison, Rector of St. Marylebone.

prayer for her as he ought unless he has first cast out of his own soul that one busy and particular devil—ecclesiastical ambition. A sacrifice here, or, indeed, in a hundred other ways, will do the Liberal Clergy no harm. It is the moral pre-requisite of duty and achievement.

Liberal clergymen must also be champions of prayer. The exercise has not, perhaps, commonly been their forte. They have appeared to think that intellectual rectifications and enlightenment will do instead. But sermons, essays, books, of however corrective and inestimable a rationality, will not do instead of prayer. These things are required too; but secondarily. They are physic; prayer is breath. They are about religion; prayer is religion. The religious folk of England want to pray; they want Christian ministers to teach them to pray, to lead them in prayer, to uplift them in prayer. In order to rise to the height of this great obligation the ministers themselves ought, individually and together, in prayer to be practised and tremendous. Let us pray for the Church of England:

Home of Thy saints,¹ O God, in our native land,

¹ This expression is largely true of the English Church, in the letter, on a long retrospect of our history; is, to a Churchman, wholly true in

BASES OF MODERNIST PREVALENCE 61

may the fires of a reasonable, holy, and living faith burn ever brightly on her hearth, for the warmth, illumination, and eternal safety of this people, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

idea and aspiration, though he remembers with admiration and gratitude the multitude of God's saints in England without the technical boundary of his own communion.

III

AN APPEAL TO THE DEAN AND CANONS
OF WESTMINSTER

(*The Nineteenth Century and After*, April 1903)

Is the English Church about, within the near future, to re-state its doctrine? Probably not. The conservative and opposing forces are too many, too compact, too alert, too belligerent. Yet a re-statement of doctrine, in the future rather more remote, is, with equal probability, inevitable, is certainly desirable, is perhaps the awaited medicine which may rescue our Anglican Christianity from mental inanition, debility, even, it might be, decay. The eighteenth century for us was Evangelical; the nineteenth was Sacramental; the twentieth, completing not conflicting, must be Liberal. What, then, is to be done? Re-statement, we say, is sooner or later indispensable; re-statement, we say, is at present impossible; what, then, are we to do about re-statement? *Prepare for it.*

To prepare for re-statement is to divert attention from the questionable to the unquestionable; to change the stress and strain of doctrine, laying the weight upon the appropriate and immovable supports; to underline the right parts, not the wrong parts, in the Christian story; to reform the emphasis of theology.

‘He descended into Hell.’ Look at Albrecht Dürer’s famous engraving in the series of the Large Passion, dated 1510, woodcut B. 14, in the British Museum. Hell is a place, an underground building with arches, through one of which shine flames of fire. Here the children of men before the Christian era had been incarcerated. Our Saviour in the foreground, one of Dürer’s beautiful four-pointed halos around His head, is kneeling at an open doorway which leads out of the prison-house, whence with delivering grip He is handing into safety a captive patriarch. Already saved and standing by are Adam, aged and venerable, holding in his right hand the apple, means of his fall, in his left hand the Cross, means of his redemption, and Eve, and others of the elect of old. From an oblong window above the door a hideous, unnatural beast, representing the Devil,

malignly thrusts at our Lord with a broken, jagged spear, endeavouring to thwart Him in His merciful pursuit. Flitting above the Devil's foul head is another offensive creature, horned, winged, bellicose, blowing a trumpet of alarm or defiance. Dürer thus beat out upon the anvil of his genius the thoughts of his time.¹ The localisation of immense spiritual objects, the materialism, the familiarities, the naïve and terrene objectivity, the categories of time and space so artlessly exported behind the veil—all this is the apt pictorial language in which the men of Nuremberg of the year 1510, if speak they must, must speak. Turn to Bishop Westcott expounding for us this article of the Creed at Peterborough in the summer of the year 1880 :

He descended into Hell, that is, into Hades, into the common abode of departed spirits and not into the place of punishment of the guilty. . . . His soul passed into that state on which we conceive that our souls shall enter. . . . We cannot be where He has not been. . . . It carries light into the tomb. But more than this we cannot say confidently on a mystery where our thought fails and Scripture is silent. The stirring pictures which early Christian fancy drew of

¹ The picture is said to have been suggested by the Gospel of Nicodemus, but the artist's imaginations are fitted to his age.

Christ's entry into the prison-house of death to proclaim His victory and lead away the ancient saints as partners of His triumph ; or again to announce the Gospel to those who had not heard it, rest on too precarious a foundation to claim general acceptance. We are sure that the fruits of Christ's work are available for every man : we are sure that He crowned every act of faith in patriarch or king or prophet or saint with perfect joy : but how and when we know not, and, as far as appears, we have no faculty for knowing.

What a shifting of emphasis since Dürer's day ! away from detail towards generality, from *mode* to *fact* ! The particulars have vanished. Stonework and mortar, archways and the licking tongues of flame, solid flesh and toothed devil dissolve, and, faded and insubstantial, leave behind the spiritual truth which they had sensibly projected. Such power for vitality, for amendment, for development of doctrine lies in *reform of emphasis*.

The Dean and Chapter of Westminster have fractured the Athanasian Hymn.¹ It is a bold withdrawal of stress from doctrinal menaces

¹ The exact facts are these. The Apostles' Creed is sung in place of the Athanasian Creed. This is an old and frequent breach of rubric. But the substance of the Athanasian Creed is afterwards sung as an anthem. Such an anthem is, of course, in itself wholly legal. The Dean, as Ordinary, is alone responsible for this change ; but there is good reason for believing that he has the sympathy of his Canons, they having raised no protest.

66 AN APPEAL TO THE DEAN AND

which, as they read in our English version, have become insufferable, and whose periodic recital is an object lesson, mischievous beyond all computation, in sacred insincerity. Ah! it goes against the grain in some of us thus to indict sections of a revered Christian Confession, of a great inherited utterance, which Keble could designate 'Creed of the Saints, and Anthem of the Blest.' Yet the indictment is true.

The immorality of the recital of those minatory clauses lies in this: they profess precisely what we do not believe. (1) Here is what we believe:

God [says F. W. Faber] is infinitely merciful to every soul, and no one ever has been, or ever can be, lost by surprise or trapped in his ignorance; and, as to those who may be lost, I confidently believe that our Heavenly Father threw His arms round each created spirit, and looked it full in the face with bright eyes of love, in the darkness of its mortal life, and that of its own deliberate will it would not have Him.

That is what we really believe. (2) Here is what we say we believe: 'Every one who does not keep whole and undefiled the Catholic Faith, as elaborated in the Creed of St. Athanasius, shall without doubt perish everlastingly.' Theologians, on harmony bent, per-

suade themselves that they reconcile those two irreconcilable lines of thought. They do not persuade other persons. To plain people the effort is futile and unpleasant. To plain people the comminations of this Symbol are beyond the reach of denial or abatement, are frowning, desolating, incredible verdicts of damnation.

The Dean and Canons' purgative action is doubly justified. (1) There is rubrical looseness all round. Only because this disobedience at Westminster is novel does it catch the eye amid the luxuriant growth of its companion and senior insubordinations. It is irrationality, at a high temperature, that extreme High Churchmen and extreme Low Churchmen should wring shocked hands when they see their own rubrical ethics achieve the flattery of imitation. You reply: Many wrongs do not make a right. They do not. But as judge-made law interprets statute law, so, in Church affairs, ecclesiastical *consensus* delimits the frontiers of documentary obligation. And this particular liturgical licence pales in moral demerit before that alternative sin—that the clergy and the congregation of the faithful, with the utmost solemnity and decision, faced eastwards towards Jerusalem, should proclaim before God and the angels

appalling judgments which, as the words stand, no person present believes to be true. That rubrical revolt is a light offence which casts out this mortal impiety. Venial is the trespass over your garden which a fireman may commit as he runs to snatch occupants of the burning house from suffocation. (2) Great reforms have sometimes grown from such audacious seed. The burning of the Papal Bull at Wittenberg was a considerable rubrical impropriety. It is difficult to read Tract XC. without perceiving that the same spirit of enfranchisement from the letter was harnessed into the service of the Oxford Movement. And now, too, some of us who believe that the English Church, entering the twentieth century, has her foot on new developments, dimly sees about her future path grander and more vital messages and meanings which she yearns to make her own and to deliver to this sterling English people—now, in this step at Westminster, we note a liberating sign. The justification of civil rebellion is said to be success. Success may justify this bold, forbidden, commendable act.

Other things may follow, we say. That two other things may follow is the motive of this appeal.

(1) This act at Westminster should be a beginning: a beginning of the expansive movement of the English Church in the twentieth century. The Dean and Canons of Westminster are in a singular position—central, authoritative, historic. They, unlike scattered and lonely Liberal Churchmen about the land, can evoke and marshal the larger sympathies, the intellectual inquietudes and desires, the beating, bounding spiritual presentiments of many thoughtful Anglicans. For instance, the Dean or a Canon there could, informally and in his private capacity, summon to Westminster a convention of representatives among the many English Churchmen who more or less falteringly cherish in isolation those dreams for the days ahead. The English Church Union has been, perhaps, the heart of the later High Church activities. A nucleus of earnest Broad Churchmen might, by inherent attraction, gather into unlooked-for shape, cohesion, power the surrounding and diffused Liberal atoms. An agent in each diocese mustering there the dispersed units; an assembly for, at first, a day at Westminster; an early morning service of Holy Communion and sermon in St. Margaret's; three sessions, in morning, afternoon, evening,

70 AN APPEAL TO THE DEAN AND

for discussion and prayer; common meals during the day, to the accompaniment of the read words of some master mind in the things of the soul—and the customarily faint and dis-united Broad Churchmen would go back to their separate homes having tasted the might of fellowship, and having seen generated from the concussions of intercourse sparks of hope, even, it might be, of sublime vision, for the spread of Christ's Kingdom in their native land.

(2) Will the Dean and Canons forgive a plain London vicar if he importunately begs, should this policy at all obtain, that they breathe into it from the first the breath of devotion? Mr. Milburn offers wise advice in his notable little book, *A Study of Modern Anglicanism* :

If Liberalism is undevotional, it will tend to be negative. . . . There is a lack, or an apparent lack, of reverence and devotion among Liberals which seems to be the cause of that flippant irreligious tone so common among them. They do not speak or write *worthily*. . . . They do not seem to think or write or speak as in the presence of God.

That is to invite for their efforts intrinsic sterility. The great fruitful movements—Monastic or Mystic, Franciscan, Lutheran, or Jesuit, Laudian or Puritan, Wesleyan or

Tractarian—have been steeped at their source in communion with the Unseen. The New Light and New Learning, in which Liberals claim to be proficient, await this supreme and recreating process. *Toute vérité nue et crue n'a pas assez passé par l'âme.* The Liberal Churchmanship which can win, which can triumphant ride and have the world at will, will be born amid the devotional deeps. 'Erant autem perseverantes in doctrina Apostolorum, et communicatione fractionis panis, et orationibus.'

IV

THE EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM
IN THE WORK OF A CHRISTIAN PASTOR

(*The Hibbert Journal*, April 1913)

WHAT is Biblical Criticism ? (1) First, it is the scholar's lens through which the Bible is seen to be not, as to the naked eye it appeared, a compact, heavenly pronouncement, marked from cover to cover by supernatural sameness ; but a gradual, expanding literature, marked from origin to climax by human fallibility and spiritual growth. (2) Secondly, Biblical Criticism is the historian's field-glass through which he, surveying the wide landscape of human achievement, can locate the Bible, can connect it with its Semitic kindred and antecedents, can compare it with the scriptures of other races and religions ; so that the Bible ceases to be a lonely and unrelated portent, and has taken its eminent place among the sacred writings of mankind. Thus has Biblical

Criticism wrought havoc and renewal. Verbal finality is gone, detailed and immaculate certitude is gone, the old inspiration—prodigious and singular—is gone, and with it the old outward authority; gone is the old detachment, aloofness from our common human story. But with the shedding of these faded attributes there have been unfolded in the Bible new glories and immensely fecund significance; and the very Spirit of the Book is perhaps beginning for the first time to break through its envelope into freedom.

For our purpose, therefore, Criticism has knocked from the hand of the Christian Pastor the Bible in its literal domination, as a weapon of infallible reference; but has left the Bible in the Christian Pastor's hand as a treasury of supreme religious experience. Exact sayings, exact deeds may, many of them, be slipping out of the Pastor's reach, may one after another be silently passing beyond the frontiers of historical certainty into the vast surrounding regions of the dimly known, or the vaguely surmised, or the mythically narrated. But the great, central, saving *facts*, *e.g.* the Passion of our Lord, survive that exit and dispersion; they stand up more than ever sharply pro-

74 EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

minent and fixed. And the great, vital, spiritual *words*, issuing from the depths of the soul of the seers—for us Christians, issuing in ultimate disclosures from the depths of the soul of our Saviour; these luminous and mighty utterances charged with command and destiny, strangely adequate to the heart's desire, corroborated from age to age in their religious validity; these words, proof against critical corrosives, are found, we think, to tell the abiding secrets of the Eternal. That is Biblical Criticism.

What is the work of a Christian Pastor? It has varied from generation to generation even in this our native land. In the fourteenth century, Chaucer's 'poor Parson of a town,' devoutly teaching his parishioners, visiting the sick in his wide parish with the 'houses far asunder,' not let by 'rain nor thunder'; or, on the other hand, Wyclif's carnal Priest, who is 'covetous of worldly muck' and 'a fiend of hell' and 'no part of holy church'—in the seventeenth century, Mr. Palmer, of the *Colonel Hutchinson Memoirs*, the Nonconformist Minister in Nottingham, who, continuing each week to preach from the grated window of the

gaol, was locked therefor every Lord's Day in the coalhouse—in the eighteenth century, Thackeray's Anglican Chaplain Sampson, a reverend rake, a two-bottle evangelist—in the nineteenth century, George Eliot's Mr. Irwine, Rector of the sweet old English village life in Hayslope, kind, unpretending, a religious Clergyman even before the Oxford Movement; or her Methodist preaching woman, of rapt vision and unearthly gentle attraction, Dinah Morris; or, to glance for a moment beyond our shores, Victor Hugo's good Bishop, Ibsen's *Brand*, Fogazzaro's *Saint*—these Christian Pastors, belonging to the same species, discover a good deal of heterogeneity in function.

A man must speak of that he knows. The present writer knows the work of an Anglican Clergyman in large rich and poor parishes of London. For our inspection that work may be cut into the following sections: (1) Preaching the gospel, (2) administering the sacraments, (3) conducting other public services of the Church, (4) teaching the young, (5) guiding individual souls; and in each section 'the effect of Biblical Criticism,' *i.e.* the effect of assumption by the Clergyman of the critical

76 EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

positions, will be noted. Observe that the entirely temporal side of a Pastor's duties, *e.g.* management of a workmen's social club or of a children's penny bank, is for our purpose rightly ignored.

1. To begin, then, with preaching the gospel. Subsections at once are needed, according as the sermons are delivered (*a*) to the educated,¹ (*b*) to the uneducated, (*c*) to the very poor in the streets, (*d*) in parochial missions.

(*a*) Educated people want—not sermons about Biblical Criticism, but sermons whose underlying assumptions are critical.

About ten years ago one hundred and sixty people of the professional and business class—lawyers, doctors, merchants, etc.—were cruising together for six weeks on a yacht in the Mediterranean. There were twelve Clergymen on board; eleven of them more or less conventional and strait, one a theological Liberal. The Sunday services, conducted first by one Clergyman then by another in the saloon, together with many private conversations, acted during those six weeks as a test or selec-

¹ The term 'educated' here carries its light and conventional meaning, by which an ordinary public schoolboy or University man, an ordinary banker or doctor, or one of us ordinary clergymen is, in the wonderful clemency of words, said to be 'educated.'

tive agency among those twelve clergy. The result was that on the last Sunday the Liberal Clergyman alone, without any assistance from any of his clerical brethren, was invited to conduct the farewell service. This indicated that he met needs which the other clergy missed. He was cognisant of the passengers' perplexities and religious confusion; he knew that the older theological prescriptions would not cure the passengers' present malady; while he found that the essential purifyings, balms, and tonics of Christianity, appropriately mixed and applied, were, as ever, profoundly grateful to the souls of this average company.

The case of sermons is probably so throughout educated England. The accredited, orthodox teachers of religion stand at the entrance of the great national life. They knock at the doors of the hearts of the people, and they cry: 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors: and the King of glory shall come in.' But the great puzzled nation, through its educated voices, replies: 'Who *is* the King of glory?' And it is only in the light of heaven *to-day*—only when we have learnt, in some humble measure according to our poor ability, the in-

78 EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

tutions of *modern* feeling, the corrections of *modern* intellect, the mandates of *modern* conscience, that we can find in the old rejoinder its latest growth, its new vitality and content, its living grandeur and everlastingness, and can say: '*The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory.*'

The effect, therefore, of Criticism in the preaching of a Christian Pastor among the educated classes is to make him more effective and acceptable. This rule is impaired by two exceptions. Two classes of educated persons do not welcome the Liberal Pastor's gospel. On the one hand, the hard and established orthodox dislike this loose evangelist; they sniff destruction; the rivets of the ark are giving way; the planks are parting; and unknown waters yawn. Where are we? Where are the old securities? 'Where,' cries the High Churchman, 'are "definite Church teaching," and "the first six General Councils"?' 'Where,' cries the Low Churchman, 'is "the language of Zion"?' 'Let us throw this Broad Church Jonah overboard.' This orthodox taste for blood is, however, actually not common; it is found mainly among curates of a Dominican aspect and ravenous theological laymen, occasionally showing its crimson tooth in the

visage of authority. What is common among orthodox persons annoyed by the Critical Pastor's gospel is more silent and more serious ; it is pain felt by gentle, old-fashioned Christians ; it is disturbance wrought among sisters, mothers, friends, of a piety which is unreflective but often fruitful in lovely life and deeds. Ah ! we share in heart their hurt ; but it is the price of advance ; *per crucem itur ad regnum*. The fixed and satisfied orthodox, on one side, thus break the rule that the educated classes incline to a critical evangel. There break the rule, on the other side, the offended and absent heterodox. These do not, as the phrase is, ' go to Church.' They have given up that particular mode of motion as hopeless. They are by no means irreligious ; but their spiritual thirst is not slaked, sometimes even is aggravated, with the aridities often held to their lips from the Anglican pulpit.¹ They have

¹ We are engaged on an inquiry which, however humble, is scientific, and which must not be deflected or mitigated by sentiment. I will try to tell the severe truth. But the Church of my fathers is to me an object of altogether unspeakable attachment. Her clergy, even when they appear to be backward and exasperating in their doctrine, are often forward and saintly in their practice. And her genius, her corporate spirit surmounts the worst defects of us her Ministers, breathing over the lives of her children her own peculiar and (for us) surpassing benediction.

80 EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

heard of Biblical Criticism; that preacher apparently has not. They share in the religious convulsion, the reverend expectancy, the awful new-birth of our age; that preacher does not share in this august experience, but dwells apart in some small dogmatic chambers of his own. And so these average Englishmen, thoughtful and numerous, renounce the Christian Pastors, good and bad—‘renounce them all.’ On the whole, then, the two said grave exceptions modify, but do not annul, the rule that among educated people accepted Biblical Criticism enhances the virtue of the preacher.

(b) Among uneducated people the conditions change. Biblical Criticism here is a non-conductor. The Critical Preacher here is at a disadvantage. He does not suit his company. They crave for doctrinal colour and detail which he cannot supply. They want something definite and vermilion; he seems to offer them something hazy and grey. In the huge structure of theology he is concerned with the foundations, which he knows to be secure; they prefer the pinnacles, which he sees to be tottering. The homiletic taste of a working-class congregation is sometimes an affliction.

A thoughtful preacher comes, and, in words of dignity and calm, narrates to the worshippers the divine, tender, elemental story of our most holy faith. They remain untouched and neutral; or, at best, they yield a mild, an almost condescending approval. A rampant young rhetorician arrives, straight from a theological college; a cheap-jack dealer in the questionable; he conducts a clearance sale of his wares—theological remnants and confident incredibilities; and he does a roaring trade, and his customers are delighted. Such incidents, whether of success or of failure, are, however, exceptional. In the long run only the religious temper, only spirituality tells. It tells among the uneducated sooner and more, if it approach them along the conventional theological channel; it tells among the uneducated later or less, if it approach them along the critical theological channel. But tell, sooner or later, more or less, here and everywhere, the religious spirit will. That, in our day of transition, is the Critical Pastor's hope. At heart the people want religion, not words. If, in the name of Christ, and in essential continuity with the inherited Christian experience of the eternal, the Critical Pastor, himself

82 EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

inwardly religious, offers to the people true religion, then the people will recognise it, even though to them the language be strange and the messenger uncongenial. Schleiermacher discovers for us the secret and the method of teaching religion with one luminous remark : *Reality knows Reality.*

(c) Thirdly, pass to the very poor ; and observe street-preaching in the slums, which sometimes is the duty of a Critical parish Pastor. Here his disability culminates. Here is a dirty, ignorant, candid, kind-hearted, spitting, swearing, sweating crowd. They gather round you — benevolent, puzzled, amused, ready for any new sensation, ready to listen. An ambassador of Jesus Christ ought to have something to say to them. I sometimes wish that writers in learned religious reviews could test their creed and their humanity with this experiment. Every man, of whatever erudition and mental distance from the mob, ought, if ever those brother men should surround him with their inquiring gaze, with those eyes so living, intent, pathetic, full of spirit, full of dumb and moving kinship with himself—every man ought then to draw from the depths of his own humanity and to impart

to his hearers some word of help, some wave of charity. The Critical Preacher must overcome his own demerits here. From behind and through his own critical apparatus he can speak to them something human, something from 'heart to heart' as they say; and, as Schleiermacher says, *Reality knows Reality*.

(d) Parochial missions demand a special kind of sermon, to agitate attention and to capture the hidden and determining purposes of men. Such preaching has sometimes been held to be alien from the Critical Pastor's disposition, and even to be precluded from his endeavours. A modest experiment in disproof of that assumption was lately made in a large northern town. In the combined Anglican mission preached there a Critical Clergyman was invited to join, expressly as a Liberal Churchman free in certain important respects from the confinement of the old orthodox constraints. His conduct of the mission in an important parish was reputed to have justified the attempt, it being declared on behalf of this Evangelical congregation that 'many had found courage to forsake cherished sins and inspiration for new tasks; that they had received a fresh and wholesome ideal of

84 EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

the Christian life, and an enlarged and purified vision of God.'

2. In administering the sacraments the individuality of the Pastor dwindles almost away, and the power of the institution rules the imagination and the facts. The specific task of the Critical Pastor here is to help in gradually weeding out from these services of his church statements or implications which affront modern knowledge. In the services themselves he is the mere organ of the society. The little child is held in the minister's arms, and the waters of heavenly potentiality are poured on its brow; the weary pilgrim kneels at the altar of the Lord, and the bread of life is placed in his hands. The minister is nothing—critical, uncritical, hypercritical; rashly radical, or implacably conservative; it matters not. The Great Mother Church is embracing her children, or is feeding them with manna from above; and that is enough.

3. Like considerations obtain in conducting other public services of the Anglican Church; it is the institution which speaks, not the individual. In morning or evening prayer, in the marriage office, in the burial of the dead the minister must voice the spirit of the Christian

centuries which breathes through the liturgy. The Critical Pastor, indeed, must strive to purge that consecrated and sublime utterance of anachronisms, of dead thought and language, and to make it the living tongue of the heart of Christendom to-day; but this duty lies on him as a Church Reformer rather than as a Christian Pastor. As a Christian Pastor he must harness himself to the use of the existing formulæ of piety.

4. In teaching the young, the aforesaid *pros* and *cons* of Criticism in preaching apply. For instance, the children of an educated home individualise, without being aware of it, that common enlightened consciousness; the children of an uneducated home insensibly partake of that educational defect; in their religious training they must be accordingly treated. But with the young the work of the Critical Pastor has one prime merit. Those children are the adult Christians of the time to come. He, if he be true to his vocation and to the vital discriminations of his day, will plant the faith of those little souls in the rich and stable soil of Christian experience, and not in a thin, sandy layer of theological convention. In teaching the young, as, indeed, elsewhere,

authority there must be, but it should be the authority of the Holy Spirit which awakes within the listening child a spiritual response and appreciation ; dogma there must be—not blind, compelling, ending in itself, but such as gradually and softly opens to the child's eyes within the dogmatic wrappage hidden spiritual jewels and pearls of great price. The young are more spiritually alert, perhaps, than we think. A youth in my Bible class may have spoken wiser than he knew, who, on being asked what was his favourite verse in the 119th Psalm, with a twinkle in his eye replied : ‘ No. 99, *I have more understanding than my teachers.*’ That stammering impeachment it especially lies on the Critical Pastor to refute.

5. The interview with single souls equals, in immediacy and moment, any part of a Christian Pastor's work. (a) A young man in your choir comes of age to-day. You send for him in the evening, and he sits there opposite to you in your study, with a look full of confidence and a life trembling with possibilities. ‘ Charlie, my lad, you step out from boyhood into manhood to-day ; you cross the line to-day. I want to remind you to be true to the holy lessons of your early years. You have

had a good home ; you have been well brought up ; the Heavenly Voice has spoken to your heart, and you have heard it. Live out as a man those holy resolutions you made as a child. Let life be to you *that*. And may God Almighty bless you.' In this interview Criticism is not a determining factor ; Criticism is a negligible factor. The determining factors are faith, prayer, and sympathy. (b) You visit a sufferer on the bed of sickness. I once read to a poor old man in pain in a Westminster garret the parable of the Prodigal Son. He sat up, leaned on his pillow, and, gazing at me, said : ' That 's as pwitty a little thing as ever I 'eard i' my life : where did yer get it ? ' Here was a freedom from critical prejudice which might have been the envy of Van Manen. Or duty may take you to the sick-chamber of a savant, a politician, a millionaire. In all cases the office for the visitation of the sick has its appropriate and marvellously adaptable meaning ; and as to the Pastor, it is not his critical, but his spiritual, temperature which tells. (c) You stand beside a man facing death. As you stretch forth your hands towards the mystery with hidden and perhaps incommunicable instincts of trust and hope, you find (in my

88 EFFECT OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

experience) two chief instruments of insight, strength, and reconciliation, for that soul entering the dark portal: (i) the service of the communion of the sick; (ii) the recitation of simple Evangelical hymns, such as 'Rock of Ages, cleft for me, Let me hide myself in Thee.' You touch bottom here. The Pastor, critical or uncritical, can do no more than so to lay the parting spirit, troubled or peaceful, in the arms of Eternal Security.

Finally, and in brief, in the Church of England the Liberal Clergyman is clerically unpopular, is subjected, at the hands of his fellow-clergy, to quiet, conscientious, immutable repugnance and depreciation. His chief trials are loneliness and the antipathy of good men. His peculiar hope is that he is serving them in spite of themselves; that he is saving for his detractors their religion; that for many an English Christian home he is breaking the shock of startling critical disclosures; that he is bearing the critical cross ahead for the sake of his fellow-pilgrims.

V

THE REAL CRISIS IN THE CHURCH

(A Letter to the *Times*, 7th September 1899)

SIR, — An engine - driver in this parish was lately by accident drowned. The funeral service was conducted in our own church. The man had been much respected. Besides the mourners some eighty of his comrades on the Great Northern and Midland Railways, gathering from various parishes, formed near the church doors two ranks, through which the hearse and coaches, both going and coming, passed. Those rows of men, with raised hats and manifest reverence, paid their tribute of honour to their friend. One thing they did not do. They did not enter the church or take any part in the service.¹

¹ It ought to be recorded that of late years at the funeral of a comrade the railway men with their families have repeatedly filled our church. What are the causes of this change? The men have gradually become persuaded that in the affairs of everyday life the clergy are their friends; the men have been treated not, as Mr. Asquith incisively warns us, with 'flabby and insipid geniality,' but with a frank confidence and candour; they have been made to

90 REAL CRISIS IN THE CHURCH

It is a little incident, a trifle, a straw ; but a straw showing which way blows the wind. And those of us who know intimately the working classes of our great cities see that the wind blows them, particularly the men, right away from those spiritual harbours of rest and refuge called churches. This fact found terse and representative avowal to me some five years ago, when I first took charge of this parish. We had been holding some debates in our working men's club on the question, Why do not working men attend church ? Not much light had been thrown upon the mystery, except that a common resentment had been declared against pew rents, which, formerly here an unfortunate parochial institution, had just recently been abolished. But after one of the discussions a checker on the Midland line came to me privately and said : ' It 'll take you years, sir, to make us chaps believe that that place ' (indicating, over his shoulder, the church) ' has anything at all to do with us. We 've no bad feeling against it—it isn't that ; but it doesn't concern us ;

feel genuinely, but not ostentatiously, welcome in the church ; the burial office has been rendered in as simple and human a manner as is possible ; the service has closed with the men's favourite hymn, which they sing in moving and resounding unison, ' God be with you till we meet again ' (Note, 1914).

it's the paddock of the well-to-do. If we get inside we don't feel comfortable or at home. It isn't our affair, and it'll take you years to make us believe it is.'

A misbelief is widespread that if churches as a rule are, unhappily, denuded of working men worshippers, yet that so-called ritualistic churches are triumphant and consoling exceptions, that they have found the secret of winning to common prayer and praise the men of the people. Napoleon bade his generals to see the facts, not pictures. That is a picture. The ritualistic churches share in the lamentable absence and reproach. Many noble men among the extreme High Church clergy have, by their self-sacrificing labours, won the esteem of all their poor parishioners; a few of the extreme High Church clergy—for instance, the Rev. A. H. Stanton—have, by their special talent for dealing with men, brought within the walls of their churches men of all kinds, poor and rich; but the average ritualistic church, while it often meets the spiritual wants of some important classes, such as are ladies and the more cultivated young men, is void of labourers and artisans and the like, scarcely touches this masculine mass of the nation.

92 REAL CRISIS IN THE CHURCH

But what is this *crisis in the Church* of which your correspondence columns, sir, and clamour generally are speaking? Is it a judgment, a distant approach or attempt towards a consideration of that momentous problem which is shouting and beating at the Church doors, of that paralysing and stupendous need—spiritually to touch the great untouched mass of English manhood? Is it the birth-throes of a great movement towards that end, such as were the coming of the friars and the field-preaching of Wesley and Whitefield? Not at all. It is a ritual crisis. It concerns primarily and explicitly details of religious ceremonial, implicitly and secondarily the relation of Church to State. And certainly these are weighty matters which deserve and find a place in Christian solicitude and polity.

The importance, however, of this particular crisis has received ample, extravagant notice. What the circumstances equally demand is that its limitations should be recognised, delineated, placarded before the country. Revert for a moment to those eighty railway men who, by their pointed and corporate abstention from a church burial service, recall—a sample of religious ill-omen a good many sizes larger—

the similar action some time ago of the municipality of Paris. Those eighty men are being told over and over again that there is a crisis in the national Church concerning the alternative of fumigatory or liturgical use of incense. The announcement falls absolutely flat ; they look at you blankly ; it is foreign to their lives and thoughts ; they suppose it is some parson's affair ; they know nothing about it ; they know sin, sorrow, temptation, the sublime desire for the things beyond and above, the elemental virtues and vices, friends and foes, in the battle of life—they know these things, and they thought that these things, not long words about incense, were the stuff of religion. They thought right. They require to be persuaded that the Church thinks so too ; that neither does the Church mistake ritual for religion, the fringe of an august subject for its centre.

Thus one urgent duty, among others, is to *place* this crisis. For the popular mind the crisis needs constant qualification. I venture to think that less harm would have followed had the nomenclature persistently been ' ritual crisis,' partial and specific, rather than ' crisis ' generic and wholesale. We must keep to the front the context. We must habitually disclose

94 REAL CRISIS IN THE CHURCH

the proportion, the relation of parts to a whole. We must focus the crisis, reduce it to its clear and just limits. At present, in common speech, it looms large and cloudy, almost filling the field of vision. Give a turn to the glass, till the whole ecclesiastical landscape stands out vast, sharp, bright, definite, and the ritual crisis takes its place in a corner among other larger questions, difficulties, possibilities, amid, we may say, the immense and encompassing prospect of the Christian religion.

Of course, there are other crises, overshadowing and dwarfing the ritual crisis when this is accurately focused, besides the said critical problem of ministering to the men of the less educated majority. There is the problem of ministering to the men of the more educated minority. It is admirably sketched in your issue of to-day by a Broad Church clergyman. 'It is not,' he writes, 'a return to the Reformation of the sixteenth century that is needed, but a new Reformation of the twentieth, and . . . it is at the very doors.' He points to the paths which are leading to that awaiting change—a new scientific philosophy, the growth of historical criticism, the decay of certain forms of thought. Of what a world of theological

revival and fertility does your correspondent here lift a corner of the curtain ! Barely mention a few names at hazard—say, Darwin, Kuenen, Renan, Harnack, Spencer, Tolstoi, Emerson — what currents are suggested of ramifying intellectual influence, whose purification and absorption, or not, within the expanding circle of Christian thought appears to some reflecting Churchmen to be the crisis of crises ! We are not preparing for it. This week I called upon a thoughtful layman, who was reading *Authority and Archæology—Sacred and Profane, Essays on the Relation of Monuments to Biblical and Classical Literature*, by Mr. D. G. Hogarth, the Rev. S. R. Driver, and others, lately published by Mr. Murray. The layman said that it would be an advantage if congregations in an ordinary parish church could sometimes hear advice on such matters as were projected in that book ; that congregations rarely were so assisted ; that it was a pity that the laity were wider readers, even on religious subjects, than were the clergy ; that many of the clergy seemed not to be in the least degree aware of the mighty and imperative religious themes which confronted and perplexed the laity. This indict-

96 REAL CRISIS IN THE CHURCH

ment, gently expressed, is charged with a terrible sting ; it is true.

Perhaps, sir, you, who during the past year have lent your powerful lens for the inspection of the ritual crisis, will do me the honour to allow me in this letter to adjust, as you and others from time to time have done, the glass to a more wide and distant horizon, and to plead with all thoughtful believers, whose lives are consecrated to the service of the English Church, and whose hopes are unspeakable for its singular vocation and opportunity in Christendom, for that continual adjustment.—Your obedient servant,

(Signed) HUBERT HANDLEY.

ST. THOMAS'S VICARAGE,
CAMDEN TOWN, N.W., *Sept. 1st.*

APPENDIX TO V

*A Letter on the subject from the Rev. Brooke Lambert,
Vicar of Greenwich*

THE VICARAGE,
GREENWICH, *8th September 1899.*

DEAR MR. HANDLEY,—Allow me to thank you for your very excellent letter in the *Times*. *Rem acu tetigisti*. Only yesterday, writing to a younger man than myself, who asked me would his children inherit a brighter vision

than that which our eyes see, I answered in effect : of the future there can be no doubt, it is in the hands of Him who has never failed whilst producing the good to keep in store the better ; but we are waiting for the prophet, and the world has not thrown up one of late—the prophet who shall lay hold on that enthusiasm for humanity, which has so much promise in it but lacks the stimulus and the outlook of the Gospel.

Such letters as yours will do good. One's eyes strain on the horizon for the signs of what must be coming. Whether you and I shall see it, I know not ; but the sad facts you mention must not shut our eyes to the fact that God is among us, and that the fields are white to the Harvest—whensoever the reaper shall come.—Yours truly,

(Signed) BROOKE LAMBERT.

VI

THE LIBERAL SERMON IN THE
PARISH CHURCH

(A Paper read to a body of Liberal Clergy, 26th May 1913)

THOREAU, friend of Emerson and of Hawthorne, went alone into the woods for two years and wrote *Walden*. Why did he go? 'I went,' he says, 'to the woods because I wished to live deliberately, to front only the essential facts of life. . . . I wanted to live deep and suck out all the marrow of life, to live so sturdily and Spartan-like as to put to rout all that was not life.' 'What is a course of history, or philosophy, or poetry . . . or the best society, or the most admirable routine . . . compared with the discipline of looking always at what is to be seen? . . . While we are confined to books . . . we are in danger of forgetting the language [of Nature] which all things and events speak without metaphor, which alone is copious and standard.' 'The things immediate to be

done are very trivial. I could postpone them all to hear this locust sing.'

Thoreau, of course, disdained the unrealities of our city life, the gaping vanity of many civilised pursuits. 'Why,' he asks, 'should we live with such hurry and waste? . . . We have the Saint Vitus' dance. . . . Let us spend one day as deliberately as Nature. . . . Let us settle ourselves, and work and wedge our feet downward through the mud and slush of opinion, and prejudice, and tradition, and delusion, and appearance, that alluvion which covers the globe, through Paris and London, through New York and Boston and Concord, through church and state, through poetry and philosophy and religion, till we come to a hard bottom and rocks in place, which we call *reality*, and say, This is, and no mistake.' The simple truth, he tells us, bears in it unequalled novelty and charm; the simple truth is God's Arabian Nights. The simple truth, too, communicates healing and calm. Thoreau's cure for the distraught nation is that we ourselves begin to be as simple and well as Nature; that we 'simplify, simplify' our lives. Poor hustling citizens of London, with our crowded agenda; watch our faces at one of our turbulent

railway termini on a Monday morning, as the packed carriages discharge us on to the platforms, our faces careworn, anæmic, tense, hurried, metropolitan. And the quiet prophet of Nature rebukes us :

Blind ! that cannot see serenity.

We Liberal Churchmen fly from the dogmatic conventions, the dogmatic artificiality, the dogmatic verbosity of the Church to-day—we fly into the woods of plain spiritual Truth. We say to that hard official world what a great French preacher once said to it : ‘ *You do not know the Galilean !* ’ A whole theological civilisation must be abandoned ; and out of it we must escape into the green pastures and waters of comfort of a new mentality. Scholasticism—its rational assumptions, complexities, logomachies ; its vast *petitio principii* ; its exposed and worn-out foundations ; its habits, watchwords, points of view—to Scholasticism, valid and protective in its day, now Farewell ! Our own Anglican classics—Pearson *On the Creed*, Paley’s *Evidences*, Liddon’s *Bampton Lectures*, Mozley *On Miracles*, Westcott’s *Gospel of St. John*—they are not, as once they were, of literal use ;

they must be read in historical perspective ; they were intellectual shelters for their time ; and now we leave them, whole streets of them, and *out* into the country, the fresh air, green leaves, and open sky.

What do we *find* after this theological clearance and exit ? In this theologically 'simple life' of ours what do we *find* ? Like Thoreau, we find the Truth ; or better, like Thoreau in his sphere, we in our sphere find Reality. We reach the thoughts of the master minds—of Isaiah, of Plato, of Sakya-Muni ; thoughts primal, permanent, humane, which are as morning air to the lungs of the mind. Christians reach, and we bow our heads as we approach, the *Spirit of Christ*. Some weeks ago I stayed with a friend in his village rectory. For five years he has disposed his spare time to a study of Clement of Alexandria with a view to publishing a work on that eminent Broad Churchman. Riding in the pony carriage, I asked him : 'How do you get on with Clement ?' His reply was remarkable. 'There are only six living persons,' he said, 'whom I know as well as I know Clement.' With that intimacy know Christ ; know the personality, the divinity of Christ. There are four main pathways thus leading to Him :

(1) the lives of the saints of God through the Christian centuries; (2) the worship of the Christian Church; (3) the Crucifix; (4) the Gospels. Along these tracks we come, hushed and reverent, to the arcana of the Spirit of Christ; we enter the Real Presence; and we are no longer what we were; 'we have put some things behind, have passed an invisible boundary; new, universal, and more liberal laws begin to establish themselves around us and within; or the old laws are expanded and interpreted in our favour in a more liberal sense, and we begin to live with the freedom of a higher order of beings.'¹ We catch the meaning of Pascal's famous fragment on the conversion of a sinner: 'The first thing that God inspires in a soul that He deigns truly to touch is an extraordinary perception by which the soul sees all things and itself in a mode altogether new.' 'He that knows the Truth,' says St. Augustine, 'knows what that Light is; and he that knows It, knows eternity.' *'Beloved, now are we the sons of God.'*

Our creed will be amended and brief. It will shed vast accretions of doctrinal garment, of fashionable theological assertion; it will be

¹ Adapted from Thoreau.

reduced from a discursive and moribund *Aberglaube* to a compact and live *Glaube*. Newman with Tract XC. reinterpreted the XXXIX Articles in a Catholic sense, stretching the use of words to the bounds of probity. We re-interpret the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds in a Liberal sense, availing ourselves to the full of all righteous latitude. We confront these two great traditional Confessions with no denial. But we demand in the two Creeds a reform, a revolution of emphasis; a few central affirmations being underlined as vital and intrinsic; the many collateral affirmations being depreciated as accessory, extrinsic, and, if occasion should order it, negligible. Professor Percy Gardner has lately outlined this reform in his articles on 'A Modern Reading of the Nicene Creed.'¹ The backbone of living spiritual assent, he says, is: Belief *in* God the Father, *in* Jesus Christ, *in* the Holy Ghost, *in* the Church. The sidebones of related, but merely intellectual, statement are: 'Maker of heaven and earth,' 'by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary,' 'sitteth on the right hand of the Father,' 'Who spake by the Prophets,'

¹ In the *Modern Churchman*, November and December 1911, January and February 1912.

‘I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins,’ and such like. These all are commentary, mere mental surrounding to that other core of spiritual conviction. Canon Rashdall’s policy of simplification is more radical. ‘The time may come,’ he writes, ‘when the proposal to substitute the original Nicene Creed (in which the clauses that most trouble the conscience are absent) for the present Constantinopolitan formula may receive a respectful hearing; but that day is not to-day. Perhaps it may be to-morrow.’¹

Not, however, to-morrow, but to-day must we existing Liberal Clergy preach. How are we to do it?

The difficulty is the congregation, who command our profound respect. We have been looking at the speaker. Look now at the listeners. They too, sitting there, contain spiritual experiences, theologies, creeds. Their intellectual make and outfit will differ among themselves in endless, incalculable variety; will differ widely from the intellectual make and outfit of the Liberal preacher. What the Bible *means* to many of them; what Church doctrine *means* to many of them—that is what

¹ *Anglican Liberalism*, p. 134.

it cannot mean to the preacher; what it cannot mean to any one much longer; it is a meaning which the preacher is there gently to discourage, gradually to displace. The chambers of the listening minds, for instance, are often occupied with obsolete Biblical presumptions, are often shut against the knocking theses of modern criticism. The congregation as a whole do not dream that before the scholars' court of Europe such critical points as these are in debate: (1) whether Christ was born miraculously; (2) whether Christ rose from the dead physically; (3) whether Christ Himself instituted the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; (4) whether the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord are anywhere certainly recorded or recoverable. Most of the congregation would be shocked and wounded were these facts to be thrust in among their pieties. Thus the critical mind of average worshippers is to the Liberal preacher old-fashioned and remote; he and they do not dwell in the same critical district, are not critical neighbours; he and they are to each other critically strange. And as in criticism, so in the whole range of religious thought and knowledge there is between pulpit and pew a wide mental gap, a developed

mental alienation. The problem for the preacher is so to adduce spiritual truth, so to conduct to spiritual reality that mental gaps and alienations forfeit their significance, no longer divide, are lost, are forgotten in the invading Presence of God.

Who is sufficient for these things? None. *Ars est artium regimen animarum*—we are dealing with the art of arts. But every man of experience herein may give advice, which is considerable if it be humble and true. Here are a few precepts.

First, negatively, (1) Never prevaricate. ‘Oh, these good!’ wrote Nietzsche. ‘Good men never speak the truth.’ And Titanic, convulsive, Nietzsche shakes the dissembling earth with the storms of his veracity. From him, our infuriate foe, we Christians may learn sober lessons; this, for one—the *primacy* of truth among virtues. Rooted it must be in our soul, as red it is in our Scriptures: ‘All liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.’ (2) Never despair. I have heard Broad Church Clergy doubt whether we have a Gospel to preach, and mutter hesitancy about the future. In the north of England there is a custom, it is said, that at Whitsuntide

families buy new clothing. A Yorkshire miner, ill in hospital, sent home £4 that his own kindred might be attired with the proper festival novelty. On the Sunday his wife and five children arrived at his bedside all clad in deep black. The woman explained to the startled man that she could not afford to robe their progeny twice, and that now they were ready for the worst. Liberal Churchmen, beware of premature mourning! *Expectans expectavi*. Our day is coming; our best pictures are not yet painted; the next two generations are ours.

Let me come now to a few positive counsels, the salt of my attempt.

(1) That preacher must see first of all, far before anything else, to his own religious reality. His own soul must be the arena where the battle has been fought. His words must stand for things—things he knows, things he loves, things he has suffered, things he has prayed about, struggled for, lost and won. His discourse must not be second-hand, stagnant water fetched in buckets from Church dictionaries; it must break out from experience within, bubble up from sincerities in the rock. The great spiritual tradition of Christendom, the immense corporate experience of believers

through the ages—who does not venerate it? But it must be individualised, protracted, renewed in the life of that preacher; so, and so only, will it tell its wonderful tale. *Pone te primus in pace*, says the ‘Imitation,’ *et tunc poteris alios pacificare*. First of all, put yourself at peace with God, and then you may bring God’s peace to your brethren.

This is true of all preachers; of the reforming preacher markedly true. You have seen a picture of Luther’s cell at Erfurt. There the conflicts were waged which determined European issues. ‘The knowledge of the Reformation,’ writes D’Aubigné, ‘which took place in Luther’s heart is the only key to the Reformation of the Church.’

(2) Unfold the Liberal significance of the Bible and Prayer Book. These are our appointed spiritual instruments; the Bible conveying God’s message to man, the Prayer Book conveying man’s aspiration to God. They have conventional meanings; accepted through centuries; contracted and grown stiff and dry with long use. But the Bible and Prayer Book are capable of fresh, fecund, Liberal meanings; they are capable of a modern animation, of a wider cognisance and a farther

reach. At a breath of intellectual request they generously expand. Both Bible and Prayer Book, indeed, need revision, need selection and supplement; but if even now they are to us a joint and spiritual treasure of inherited and incomparable worth, we can help others to find in them this divine value. ‘And the priest said, The sword of Goliath the Philistine, whom thou slewest in the valley of Elah, behold, it is here wrapped in a cloth behind the ephod: if thou wilt take that, take it: for there is no other save that here. *And David said, There is none like that; give it me.*’

(3) We must be friends, not foes, to Low Churchmen and to High. They represent the two inbred and enduring strains of the faith: (a) personal religion and (b) institutional or corporate religion. ‘Some men prefer sermons, and some sacraments.’ But Catholicity and Evangelicalism as we know them often bristle at each other, and set their teeth; they must rise to a higher synthesis, mutually no longer hostile but congenial. Up this pacific ascent Liberalism must lead them. Liberalism is here—we speak with reverence—not to destroy but to fulfil.

(4) Let the Liberal sermon be affirmative.

Its negations must be veiled and incidental. Let the Liberal preacher be true to educated hearers, tender to uneducated ; 'firm as a diamond, and softer than a mother.' So, his speech must ever bring something with it, not take something away. Religion the people want. Reasonable religion we will try to give them ; religion in a rational key, set to science, attuned with modern knowledge. But still religion it must be. Religion is the substantive, reason the adjective. A preacher may be charged with superior information, with destructive criticism, like a live rail charged with electricity and danger ; he must not discharge himself at that innocent congregation. He is there to preach the Gospel. If he preach the Gospel sincerely enough, he will cure his hearers of their mental errors insensibly ; their ignorance will drop off by decay and not be expelled by torture. The ravens of controversy had better not settle in the pulpit. Eagles are wanted there that mount up to the throne of God.

(5) In temporal matters, in conduct, the Liberal preacher, exempt now from the toil of doctrinal reconstruction, is at ease, is at home. Take, for example, the surging Social Question.

Reflect on the origins of Christian Social Reform. Bishop Ketteler and Pastor Stöcker led in Germany; Lamennais and Lacordaire in France; Maurice and Kingsley in England—our heroes, our teachers, our kin. And when High Church Bishops to-day breathe out social threatenings and slaughter, they are immigrants who have climbed up our hill; while we are inhaling our native air.

(6) Let us Liberal Clergy lead the simple life and in our parishes let us work. To us, also, the Benedictine rule applies: *Otiositas inimica est animae*—ease is bad for character.

One morning years ago the Bishop laid his hands on our head, gave us the Bible, and said: ‘*Take thou authority to preach the Word of God.*’ We shall never forget it. The power of that commission sometimes yet makes me shake. The field, too, and the occasion of our endeavour are of a grandeur to match. The religion of our fathers is coming to new life, and the English race await with wonder and hope its resurrection. For our great task we may still use this, our fathers’, great prayer: ‘Merciful Lord, we beseech thee to cast thy bright beams of light upon thy Church, that it being enlightened

112 THE LIBERAL SERMON

by the doctrine of thy blessed Apostle and Evangelist Saint John may so walk in the light of thy truth, that it may at length attain to the light of everlasting life ; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*'

VII

THE SECRET OF PERSONAL INFLUENCE
AND THE NEED

(An Address delivered to a body of Liberal Clergy at the Service of Holy Communion, 9th May 1912; published in the *Modern Churchman*, June 1912)

RICHARD HOLT HUTTON somewhere says which English sermon he holds to be the greatest of the nineteenth century. It was preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday afternoon, 22nd January 1832, by John Henry Newman, and was called 'Personal Influence, the Means of Propagating the Truth.' Newman asks in it how Christianity really came to spread. He adduces and discards one alleged cause after another until he comes to his own allegation — that it spread by personal influence. 'Not as a system, not by books, not by argument, not by temporal power, but by the personal influence,' of real believers, he writes. 'Say they are few, such high Christians . . . they are enough to carry on God's noiseless work.'

Precisely the same truth is taught in *Ecce Homo*. The beautiful, radiant passage begins : ' How do men become for the most part " pure, generous, and humane " ? By personal, not by logical influences. They have been reared by parents who had those qualities, they have lived in a society which had a high tone,' etc.

The key of transmission, then, or rather, the key of creative evolution in Christendom, is personal influence.

One step farther back the question pushes. If personal influence is the key of spiritual extension, what is the key of personal influence ? What is the key of the key ? The great devotional writers, at least, have no doubt. The guides of the inner life, of the motive and aspiration of Christians, age after age, give a common answer. I do not say that theirs is the only answer ; but it is, at least, considerable. They concur, with impressive unanimity, in alleging one secret of Christian personal influence. What is it ? It is the subjection of self-will ; the surrender and trained growth of the will into concert with the Divine Will ; not my will, but Thine. The Roman Catholic, Protestant, Anglican classics here agree. Let us call witnesses.

1. The earlier books of St. Augustine's

Confessions are probably unequalled in their vivid, drawn-out picture of the tossing, rolling soul, struggling to yield itself up, yet not yielding itself; half yielding, unyielding, yielding again; but never out-and-out.

I neither willed entirely, nor nilled entirely. . . . I all but did it, and did it not, hesitating to die to death and to live to life. I sent up these sorrowful words: How long? how long? Why not now? Why not is there this hour an end to my uncleanness?

The conversion is when, out-and-out, he does it.

2. St. Bernard, *On Consideration*, says:

Woe to wills opposed! What penalty is so severe as to be ever choosing what shall never be? Is there any hell like [the perverse will]?

3. Thomas à Kempis, whose name some of us can hardly ever mention without an act of reverence, suffuses his masterpiece with the same lesson. Some of you will remember how throughout the *De Imitatione* the pedal notes keep sounding 'voluntas Dei.'

4. The *Letters* of St. Catherine of Siena turn the lesson over, and turn it back; present it at all angles and in all aspects. 'Kill thy self-will. . . . Let the soul drink deep of the Blood, and therein consume its self-will.'

5. Père Grou in *The Hidden Life of the Soul*, like muezzin from minaret, keeps calling : Cast thyself on to the Divine Will.

6. The Protestant mind is not behindhand. *Theologia Germanica*, Luther's favourite manual, grows around the same doctrine as its centre. Adam's bite, it says, in the apple was self-will. ' Nothing burneth in hell but self-will.'

7. Bunyan, in *Grace Abounding*, describes the initial commitment of the soul with his own nervous and unstudied force :

I will leap off the ladder even blindfold into eternity, sink or swim, come heaven, come hell, Lord, if Thou wilt catch me, do.

8. The modern German, Wimmer, affirms the principle in *My Struggle for Light* :

O God, I beseech Thee, keep omnipotence in Thine own hands ; leave me but submission.

9. Anglican devotional masters — George Herbert, William Law, Keble—reiterate the precept. They may be represented by one couplet of Herbert :

O let Thy sacred will
All Thy delight in me fulfill ! ¹

¹ Dante, not technically a devotional writer, in one line gives to the lesson serene and famous utterance.

The secret, therefore, of Christian personal influence is this : Not my will, but Thine.

The Will of God ! It is awful, illimitably grand, beyond my measures and soundings. Yet at the bases of my being are instincts which tell me something of its quality : It is sane ; it is alive with that in it which answers to what in my human experience I call 'love' ; it is reliable—I launch my little craft upon its waters and it buoys me up, it does not yawn and let me through, it does not let me down, down into nothingness, it is sustaining ; and it lasts, the 'living will that shall endure when all that seems shall suffer shock.'

And to this Will of God I am to bend, to affiliate my poor, wayward human will, if, as we learn, I am to gain and exert the Christian influence. I must first of all achieve the great, prime surrender ; must somewhere deep within, first vow the vows, the silent vows, that make us men and shape our destiny ; must first plunge into the Divine Will determinedly ; and then must move on in it through life with immense docility and progressive accord.

My brothers, Liberal Churchmen can do this. Broad Churchmen, Modernists can do this ; can do this as well as others. We can acquire

this secret. There is in it nothing dogmatically prohibitive ; nothing thin and quarrelsome ; nothing Dominican ; there is no theological or critical rigidity, barring the joy. This secret is large, elemental, child-like, open to the penitent heart, to all sincere and humble search. And we Liberals must acquire the secret in the old Christian way ; by duty to God and duty to our neighbour, as the Catechism says ; by That-world ethics, as von Hügel puts it, and by This-world ethics. There is nothing abnormal about us ; we are not an odd, new sect ; we are English Churchmen ; and to acquire the Christian secret we, like our fathers, have just to pray and work.

(a) To pray : there is the long, commanding experience of Christendom on behalf of devotional habit, public and private — in sacrament, petition, praise, confession, Bible, hymn, canticle. Two nights ago I heard a learned Jew say that spoken prayer is a mere ritual, and that, as to-day the sacrificial ritual of ancient Israel is obsolete, so in a remote future spoken prayer will have been abandoned by men who will commune with God. Let pre-scient minds predict ; I do not know. But as yet the devotional practices of Christendom abound in validity, in proved fecundity, in

incalculable promise ; they pulse with vigour and effect. We must draw from them their virtue, like other Christians. We must pray. It is at the root of That-world ethics, of love of God.

(b) At the root of love to man, of This-world ethics, is work. Like other Christians we are to work ; to pour the waters of character, drawn from the eternal springs, out upon plain daily duties. Home is the centre : it is a simple tale, but we reformers are to begin at the hearth, to follow the old domestic standards of our most holy Faith with their sweet, conservative allurements. Next comes the parish : we Liberal Clergy are to repel the charge of parochial sloth, are to sweat, toil, suffer for that pastoral group of the human brotherhood, to answer the dumb appeal which looks out from the grey eyes about us there. Lastly, we too must heed the clamant, resounding endeavours of Social Reform ; the industrial heaving, derangement, unrest, the rumblings of pain, the agitations of hope, of new life, of racial vitality. ‘Except a society be born again, it cannot see the kingdom of God.’

The Crucifix, by a monumental use, is the point where these lessons of prayer and work, of beatific vision and of human succour, are

incomparably focused. The Crucifix is the symbol which mankind appeared to want; it shines adequately with eternal and with mortal light; it gathers up our needs, our loves, our ultimate helps and obligations into a kind of luminous finality. ‘O Jesu, splendor aeternae gloriae, silentium meum loquitur tibi.’

My brothers, there is much for us of sober cheer. We Liberal Clergy are being put, no doubt, to trial. First, long ago in the interior life of us all there probably has been, again and again, a wrestling at the brook Jabbok, and we would not let the angel go except he blessed us; a struggle sometimes not without grief and tears. And to-day round about us is encompassing difficulty—the misunderstanding of the multitude, the frown of authority, the repugnance of good men. But, on the other hand,

Thou hast great allies;
Thy friends are exultations, agonies,
And love, and Man’s unconquerable mind.

To serve a great cause in dark days is to every knightly nature a privilege. And few causes can be greater than in the land of our fathers once more to build the old waste places of the Church, and from evangelical embers and ashes once more to light the living fires and illumina-

tions of the Gospel. ‘*O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion, get thee up into the high mountain ; O thou that tellest good tidings to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with strength ; lift it up, be not afraid ; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold, your God !*’

VIII

OUGHT THERE TO BE A BROAD
CHURCH¹ DISRUPTION ?(The *Hibbert Journal*, January 1914)

‘ Man comes nearest to God when he is truthful.’—
A maxim attributed to Pythagoras

A LAYMAN lately spoke in hot tones to me of the Liberal Clergy. He arraigned us wholesale. He discoursed in full charity of individuals ; but of the Liberal Clergy as a class he said in brief : ‘ You ought all to go out. Chalmers and his hundreds of ministers broke away from the Church of Scotland, and Scotland to-day, in the prospect of righteous reunion, is reaping the moral benefit of their fidelity. You English Broad Church Clergy hold untenable ground ; you deceive yourselves, persuade yourselves,

¹ Broad Church principles are here taken to imply : (1) a mental welcome to all knowledge ; (2) a conviction that dogma is ever provisional and from age to age demands reform ; (3) a sense of native and profound inadequacy in human language as an instrument for the expression of spiritual realities. The description, in effect, is borrowed from a lecture by Canon Vernon Storr.

sophisticate ; you settle awkward questions in an illicit, favourable sense—as we all, if we try, can do ; you lead young ordinands to tamper with their consciences ; you speak and write volumes of special pleading ; if you would do the straight deed and go out, you would work more good than can all your books, articles, and sermons ; you would begin to work good indeed, and you will not till then.’

Thus stated, with new point and actuality, this charge commands from me, at least, once more deliberation. It is an old indictment. Let us first recall some classic expressions of it.

Lord Morley’s *On Compromise* springs at once to the memory. Long ago, during seven years or more of hesitation whether to be or not to be ordained, I spent weeks grappling with that book, settling my own account with the vehement sincerities of that attack.

The first advance towards either the renovation of one faith or the growth of another, must be the abandonment of those habits of hypocritical conformity and compliance which have filled the air of the England of to-day with gross and obscuring mists.

So ends the searching chapter on ‘Religious Conformity.’ Again, Dr. James Martineau,

lofty, just, in whom was no guile, has left on record (*Life and Letters*) this grave judgment :

I am persuaded that honourable laymen, themselves of Broad Church sympathies, are more awake than is commonly supposed to the essential immorality of the Liberal clerical position. An eminent man among them said to me to-day, with a shrug of his shoulders, 'I could not for a week do what they (the Broad clergy) do through life.' I never met with a layman who does not say the same ;

though Martineau, with merciful inconsistency, on the death of Dean Stanley wrote thus :

With him the greatest *personal* power I have ever known has passed from us. The loss to London in particular is something quite unique.

Again, probably the most weighty conservative utterance on the precise topic of clerical veracity is the essay of Professor Henry Sidgwick. There a master-hand marks out the moral boundaries : he fixes a clear dividing line between lay obligation to theological orthodoxy and clerical obligation ; while Liberal laymen may walk in a wide circle of freedom, around the Liberal Clergy confining ropes are drawn.

No attempt here is made to expound these authoritative writings. They ought, indeed, to be named ; they ought to be respected, to be

studied by every man confronted with the related problems. Let him weigh this impressive advice. Let him hear those trumpets of warning and integrity. Let him listen to philosopher and friend—listen and learn. ‘A wise man feareth and departeth from evil ; but the fool rageth and is confident.’ Yet after all a man is himself and not somebody else. At last he must retire into himself and choose : deep down there, where he meets in silence the Eternal Right, he must decide alone.

Am I honest ? Can I remain a Broad Church Clergyman without a moral twist ? Have I thrown dust before my own moral vision—just enough to blind me to the quibble of my life, while leaving me otherwise a fairly useful person ? Have I caught the taint of equivocation ? lost the central virtue of simplicity and downrightness ? Must I pose ? Is the ground on which I stand not moral rock, but moral sand ? and with its very subsidence must I shift ? Dare I speak out what I believe ? Am I holding something back ? smothering something up ? In my right hand is there *supressio veri*, and *suggestio falsi* in my left ?

Not only Broad Church Clergymen will be the better for asking themselves on occasion these

or kindred questions. They might brace and purify any man. I, at least, a Liberal in Anglican Holy Orders, welcome them ; welcome their searchlight into the recesses of my conscience. And I come back from that self-scrutiny and tell whomsoever it may concern why I remain, and, God willing, intend to remain, at my clerical post. The grounds of my judgment are three.

(i) I am at home in this Church of England. I love it. The sacred influences of my life dawned within its fold. The memories of my childhood, of my first home, of my first attachments, are steeped in its benediction. Snatches from its liturgy, mottoes from its walls, legends from its windows, the awe of its music, the peace of its sanctuary—these woke the better man in me, gave me my first ideals, spelt out my first watchwords, introduced me to the things most high. If heaven lies about us in our infancy, heaven broke through the veil to me sacramentally in the worship of that wonderful Church. It spoke to me. The peal of its bells and the accents of its prayer and praise yet reverberate from those old days in the corridors of my remembrance with a lifelong, incomparable charm. For me that Church has never failed. Early and late, from youth to middle age, the

Church of my fathers has been to me the channel of wisdom and grace and has fed with divine nutrition my ultimate needs.

But, says an objector, do you believe the *doctrines* of the English Church ? Your sentiment, he concedes, is evidently Anglican : you must, however, he insists, go further ; you must assent to the Anglican formularies and accept the Anglican creed.

On a later page I will make my own profession of belief ; that act is, I reckon, demanded from me by candour. Meanwhile I declare my accord with the Church of England in a realm deeper than doctrine. My adhesion to this Church is ultra-rational. *Là, où finit le raisonnement, commence la véritable certitude.* I believe in the spirit of the Church of England—the spirit which through fifteen hundred years and more projected, adumbrated the doctrines. There is a soul in this august institution. That soul has stammered out its own unspeakable experience through the centuries in liturgies, hymnodies, theologies, confessions, homilies, debates. These lisping notes of the intelligence are the language of that soul—a language which in dim degree, tentatively, fallibly, variably intimates the experience within, the life hid with Christ in God

of the society. The language intimates the experience, conserves it, transmits it; is a vessel in which the experience is held. The language must be there. But it is the soul which matters. The language changes, has changed, will change; is never more than suggestive; discloses at its first word and its last its own ingrained insufficiency; must be mended in its expression from one generation to another, that it may not fall too far short of its necessary, verbal endeavour. The language, though requisite, is light and secondary. It is the soul which matters. I believe in the soul of the Church of England; it is the Holy Ghost within those limits; I have been born again of it; all that is best in me is akin to it; my real self belongs to it and it is intrinsically mine. At the root of things it is this, not dogmatic technique and propriety, which makes a Churchman.

(ii) I have clerical comrades. There is a group of Liberal Clergy who are at home in this English Church. Each one of us is not alone; he stands in resolved ranks. *Multi societate tutiores*. We are a company which has an inveterate right and duty within the Anglican borders. Baron Fr. von Hügel, whose philosophic credit is European, has proved the

necessity and laid bare the functions of High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, and Broad ; of the institutional, mystical, rational elements respectively in religious totality. The Liberal school has played its effective part through English Church history in a long line of intellectual purgation. It is vigorous and alert to-day. Times of transition are its call and opportunity. Liberal laymen in the educated world are probably now the majority. Liberal Clergy avowed are comparatively few, though clergy High and Low with dumb, sometimes unconscious, Liberal proclivities are almost certainly numerous. But the few open clerical Modernists count by the hundred ; are a group as large as were the founders of other commencing reforms, Methodist or Tractarian ; appear numerically to be growing, to be growing still more in confidence, prospect, enthusiasm ; are, perhaps more than any other clergy, alive with a sense of mission ; mentally are leavening the ecclesiastical mass with a quiet irresistibleness. Within the Anglican Church at this hour these Liberal Clergy are a solid, contained fact. They are here ; they have won recognition for themselves and for even their extreme teaching, have won something at least of that

‘common understanding’ which, as Professor Henry Sidgwick admits, can cover doctrinal defect.

This recognition it is which pioneers of other important and contested change are seen to have gained for their cause. The originators of the Oxford Movement, with admirable persistency against popular misconception and dislike, evoked from the Anglican Church its potential Catholic characteristics, until they succeeded in stamping on it an evident Catholic impress, until they conquered for themselves within the Anglican communion a position gradually unquestioned, at last, as we see, predominant.

And for us Liberal Clergy, too, recognition will not suffice; our principles are not to be tolerated, they are to prevail. We invade the opponents’ camp right and left. (*a*) Right: We claim not sufferance, but control; we will have from the conservatives no condescension; we are not permitted, we are essential; the need of us now, moreover, is surpassing, and the very age is ours; we stand at the springs of the Church which is to be, and its secret is in our keeping; inchoately, in hidden potentiality and slow genesis, we even *are*

the future Church ; and the other Anglican schools, High and Low, in the long run will only live, will only maintain their beneficent power, when they shall have learnt our lessons and have been reanimated with our vitality.

(b) Left : The conservatives must look to their own honesty ; ruridecanal chapters must repent of their sometimes obdurate ignorance, of their blind reluctance to study the alphabet of the modern religious revolution ; if haste may be immoral, so may delay ; at a difficult turn in the road, to see obscurely or to see askant is not so dangerous nor so craven as to shut your eyes ; to strive amid the perplexities of Biblical criticism for a straight path, for the permanent clue, for assured, even if distressing results, is more respectable than to shirk the critical issue and to run from the critical truth. All conservatives are not guilty of these sins — far from it ; but some, perhaps many, are. And if questions are mooted of exclusion from the English Church, it may be asked whether it is not this evasive temper which first of all should be driven out.

(iii) I dare proclaim my belief — that is, my own interpretation of the common creed. Interpretations vary with interpreters ; are

necessarily and exactly as many as are these ; to every man a fresh one and his own ; *quot homines, tot credenda*. I do not hesitate to declare mine. At bottom there is nothing to hide. We Liberal Clergy are not furtive Churchmen. Doubtless in religious teaching, as in other regions of didactic statement, the differing qualifications of the listeners, their graded intelligence and culture, call for respect and accommodation ; child and adult, simple and thoughtful, illiterate and erudite neither invite nor allow to a preceptor the same educational approach ; they live one set in one intellectual world and another set in another, and only the language of their own world can each set understand. You must not obtrude points of destructive criticism and doubts which are shaking Churches upon the untroubled piety of the village. But on due occasion, in the proper court of obligation, we Liberal Clergy can speak out utterly the belief that is in us. When we have spoken it, Professor Henry Sidgwick, though he holds that other immoral effects may ensue where the Liberalism is extreme, grants that in us there is ‘no substantial unverity.’ I will so speak out here and now.

But first we must keep off the field a few popular and vagabond errors.

(a) What is a creed ? Words are feeble indicators of spiritual things, as we saw in detail above. Yet words for ever bubble up as signs of movement in the deep waters. Some of these words are caught and become fixed as *standards of suggestion* ; they are adopted as the verbal representations of the Faith ; they become to the Christian society media of preservation and growth, tokens of fellowship, incentives to combat ; they sound in the councils, echo in the services, glitter on the banners of the Church. A creed is such a fixed array of words, authoritative and compact ; it is, indeed, the art of religious formulation at its highest, the climax of dogmatic activity. But a creed is not perfect, not magical, not final.¹ It is an effort of the human tongue,

¹ Liberalism discredits dogmatic finality. 'The man who has arrived at the goal,' says the proverb, 'is but at the beginning.' Liberalism urges its view against conventional opinion. 'Of course the Creed, as a compendium of theology, does belong to the static ante-development stage of thought. All the "lettings out" of theology by gussets and patches have been made under protest ; and profess to be mere logical explicitations. We now, looking back, see that the Creed ought to have been imposed merely as provisional—as registering the state of theological development of that day ; as destined to be transformed into a better symbol ; but in fact it was imposed, and is still imposed, by "officialdom" as

fallible, amendable. It is terminology in all its transiency. It is the ecclesiastical language of one age passed on to the lips of the next—and again passed on. In each succeeding period, no doubt, it takes to itself new meanings, and it rises time after time to new intellectual occasions. But a day may come when it will need literal revision ; the substance of it, what it ever essentially aimed at, being retained ; the nomenclature, the turn of the phrases, the subordinate affirmations being, for the wants of that day, improved. *Idem aliter*. Thus may Christendom, with awful reverence and hope, by and by review the muniments of its belief.¹

(β) The Nicene Creed is among creeds the

final, at least so far as it goes. Hence the “*Lex Orandi*” treatment of the difficulty is to some extent an “economy” (to use a polite term), an attempt to stretch the old bottles in default of new. . . . During the period of transition I suppose we must suffer these wretched “economies.” . . . We cling consciously to the earthen vessel lest through our imperfect discrimination we should part with any life-giving remnant of the heavenly treasure that may cleave to it’ (*Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell*, vol. ii. pp. 184, 185).

¹ ‘When men are sufficiently prepared by an understanding of the principles of religious growth, we shall have to recognise the right of each age to adjust the historico-philosophical expression of Christianity to contemporary certainties, and thus put an end to this utterly needless conflict between faith and science, which is a mere theological bogey’ (*Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell*, vol. ii. p. 185).

chief. It is the uppermost bough of the confessional tree, whose luxuriance may be traced back to the green shoots of primitive baptismal formulæ. It protects something which the heart of the Christian world in spiritual experience had found to be precious and felt to be central. ‘First the thing,’ insisted Pestalozzi, ‘then the word.’ The Athanasians only stammered out what the heart of Christendom had the instinct for and wanted to say. In the wide hall of the Christian consciousness and during the debate of a hundred years the Athanasians doggedly moved their resolution, the Arians doggedly moved their amendment. The amendment was lost in the end ; the resolution was carried ; and the heart of Christendom approved. Yes ! in effect it cried, we want that word spoken, that word of hard theology ; we want that inner experience of ours made articulate ; we have been dumbly aware of it for generations in our souls, aware of it wonderingly within ; it is a secret which we knew in the hidden depths, which we lisped in supplication ; now you have spelt it out on the legible tables of the mind ; it is put into intellectual preserve ; it will shine over our heads, a watchword ; what we revered as a

mystery we realise as a doctrine—the Divinity of Christ.

(γ) Clergy do not recite the Creed as individual schoolboys to a schoolmaster, performing a set task, under fear of inspection and the rod. Rather, if the comparison be not too trivial, do they recite it *con amore* as Etonians old and new might sing together the Eton Boating Song. It evokes the spirit of the institution and gives to it broken, yet inspiring, collective utterance. The Creed is the verbal badge of a great society; it is a venerable, hereditary statement, scientific in mould, but mystic in essence, conceived in symbolism, imbued with poetry; it is ‘practically or equivalently rather than mathematically adequate’; it is the succinct, official, best attainable, dogmatic averment of the brotherhood; a Catholic sign, not a theological trap. You are not to pick out with the pincers of inquisition a clause here or a clause there; to hold it up before some thoughtful, anxious priest; to exact from him some strait, conventional assent; or, if he fail in your ordeal, to pin him to the wall and cry, Now we have you! Professor Sidgwick, it must be owned, saw in the minister’s ‘I believe’ that rigorous

personal obligation. I venture wholly and fervently to differ. The 'I believe' is representative. If the clergyman is in general mental agreement with the words of the Belief, and is in entire spiritual concurrence with its underlying purport and endeavour, he is herein a fit organ of congregational speech. Dr. Sanday, Lady Margaret Professor, is reported (the *Hibbert Journal*, October 1912) to have declared that he repeats a creed

not as an individual, but as a member of the Church.

Canon J. M. Wilson (*The Use of the Apostles' Creed in Worship*) lately preached in Worcester Cathedral thus :

We may in perfect intellectual sincerity repeat the Creed with its implications of mystery and miracle, as the essence of our Christian belief as a body, rather than as the scientific expression of our individual present opinions ; and thus we possess continuity with the Church of every age, continuity with our own childhood, and continuity with our fellow-Christians in every stage of thought, however different from our own, and in so doing we worship in truth.

Father Tyrrell, a knight of truth, gave (*Lex Credendi*) to our claim commanding assertion :

It is not then directly as an expression of my own private judgment and spiritual orientation that I

say the *Credo*, but as an expression of the Church's collective Faith, which I desire to share and appropriate, and which I acknowledge as a rule or norm. I say it as a quasi-sacramental act of association with the corporate life of the Christian people, past, present, and future. It is the 'I' of the whole Church which finds voice in me and in each of her members. 'Credimus,' Πιστεύομεν, 'We believe,' was the older formula, as it is that of the *Te Deum*, and it gives us the true sense of the newer.

But since this is so, it is plain that in reciting the Creed I do not address myself to, or profess to be in inward agreement with, any other individual or school or passing phase of theological thought; that none of these have any more right to rule my spirit than I have to rule theirs; that the only norm I acknowledge is that to which they must defer as well as I—that of the slowly forming but divinely guided mind of the living Church of all times and all places, of which mind the Creed in its present form is the only authorised expression.

(δ) The argument of this paper justifies a place among the clergy for extreme Broad Churchmen. A member myself of the Liberal right wing, I desire to approve and exonerate the left. You cannot draw odd chalk lines across the path of clerical Liberalism and say at will, 'No farther.' Especially are Liberal *clergy* of slower pace morally prohibited from thwarting and upbraiding their swift, it may be precipitate,

brethren. Yet those cautious Liberals are for ever making that attempt. It is an unreasonable tale. The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds (to speak for a moment of both) have in interpretation expanded by degrees. (1) 'Right hand' has been stretched to cover immaterial precedence; (2) 'Maker of heaven and earth,' to cover the cosmic processes of evolution; (3) 'Resurrection of the body,' to cover *post-mortem* idealism; (4) 'To judge both the quick and the dead,' to cover vast, gradual discrimination; (5) 'Who spake by the prophets,' to cover all the valid inspirations of humanity; (6) 'Descended into hell,' to cover entire delocalisation; (7) 'Ascended into heaven,' to cover a non-spatial exaltation; (8) 'The third day he rose again,' to cover objective revival and Christophanies apart from corporal resuscitation; (9) 'Born of the Virgin Mary,' to cover a non-miraculous but sacrosanct birth.¹ Strange that, speaking loosely and approximately, each group of liberating expositors has assailed its more advanced companions; that each group has been, in some measure, perse-

¹ Well might T. H. Green declare (*Two Lay Sermons*): 'It is only in word, or to the intellectually dead, that the creed of the present is the same as the creed of the past.'

cuted, and in its turn has inclined to persecute, has been defendant in one age and prosecutor in the next. Group 2 has cast at group 3 the reproaches aimed at itself by group 1 ; group 3 against group 4 its own picked-up and similarly spent missiles. And now the first seven groups appear to unite in action for the censure and arrest of groups 8 and 9.¹ It is arbitrary, and it may not be. You cannot carve Liberalism into two clean and separate halves, marking one 'allowed' and the other 'forbidden.' Liberalism is a body of principles which embrace restrained practitioners and violent. In no case, however elementary, is clerical Liberalism free, or ever has been, from difficulty of conduct. To use words in an unusual sense is never sweet

¹ Professor Sidgwick himself draws an iron line against group 9 ; he affirms that if the miraculous birth of Christ be withdrawn there falls 'the vast weight of Nicene Theology.' The teaching of such a man compels me, a plain working Clergyman, to a respectful attention. But Dr. Sidgwick was eminent as a moral philosopher, not as a doctor of the Church, and he is no expert in appraising the securities and props of theology. In this sphere we may set over him at hazard, say, Dr Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells, who in his noted open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury writes : 'The Incarnation is a cardinal doctrine of the faith. . . . But to say that the historical fact of the Virgin-birth is a cardinal doctrine of the faith is to use language which no Synod of Bishops, so far as I am aware, has ever ventured to use. It is to confuse the Incarnation with the special mode of the Incarnation in a way for which Christian theology offers no precedent.'

to the honest man ; it is not simple enough ; and, as the 'Imitation' says, *Beati simplices*. But in a period of stress it may be a duty thus, sometimes painfully, to serve the fundamental realities of the Church, which are the fundamental interests of mankind.¹

My own belief is this :

(1) I accept the Nicene Creed. (2) At once I distinguish. I mentally shift the emphasis more and more on to the great spiritual affirmations of that reverend symbol, away from the detailed historical affirmations ; (3) because the spiritual affirmations (*e.g.* ' I believe in one God . . . and in one Lord Jesus Christ . . . being of one substance with the Father . . . And I believe in the Holy Ghost . . . and I believe one Catholick and Apostolick Church ') appear to me to be the proper and sure exercises, and to be based on the inward experience, of the common Christian consciousness ; whereas the detailed historical affirmations (*e.g.* ' He suffered and was buried, and the *third day* he rose again according to the Scriptures, and *ascended* into heaven '), literally interpreted, stand on the authority, and, so to speak, at the

¹ According to that fine definition of religion as ' the adjustment of our conduct to a transcendent world.'

mercy, of a small band of trained historical scholars. (4) This distinction obtains, in my judgment, even in the case of the central doctrine, viz. between (*a*) the spiritual affirmation of the Incarnation, on the one hand, and (*b*), on the other hand, the historical affirmation of the physical miracle—which is of the Incarnation the traditional mode and concomitant. (5) I accept the record of this physical miracle of the Nativity with far less assurance than the record of that spiritual fact of the Incarnation ; because I believe that of that spiritual fact the Christian consciousness, exerting its just functions, has been an abiding and age-long witness, whereas from the physical miracle historical science (here the appropriate and final decider) appears, in the voices of its chief European authorities, to be more and more averse—the critical chemistry seeming more and more to put the supernatural, containing narrative into natural solution. That miracle, however, has been ingrained in the Christian consciousness for eighteen hundred years ; it has been ingrained in my consciousness (with one obscuring interval) from childhood ; therefore I hold on to it with struggling hope against, as I think, the present verdict of the best historical

research and erudition, expecting that this verdict (retracting, devious, zig-zag as it has been in its progress from generation to generation—now destructive, now restoring, now discordant, now unanimous) may yet, before it reaches its goal, take another conservative turn.

(6) But madness it were not to look ahead ; to shut one's eyes and ears to the immense critical disturbance ; not to prepare, especially in view of critical exploits in the Old Testament, for a possibly adverse critical issue in the New Testament ; to rear the Christian edifice on territory which we rent from the historians, and from which they may oust us, rather than on the native spiritual ground and indefeasible freehold of the Church. This would be again to play the obscurant and disastrous part of the Roman Church in Spain, of the Eastern Church in Russia. Even so staid a journal as the *Guardian* was alive, and radically alive, fourteen years ago to these possibilities. In a long review, 31st January 1900, of Professor Percy Gardner's *Exploratio Evangelica*, it writes :

Now if it should prove on a fair and thorough criticism (and this is the work, not of one man, but of a generation) that on historical grounds the conclusions summarised in this book, or others like them,

are true, then Professor Gardner has done a work of simply inestimable value in sketching the lines of reconstruction. And it will be found that he retains a large proportion of what ordinary Christians most value, though under forms which at first sight seem strange and even repellent.'

These anticipations are akin to the forecast of the present writer. (7) Religion in accord with Science ; ecclesiastics docile, repenting of our immemorial error ; the host of Christian pilgrims chanting their processional hymn in tune with knowledge ; *mentally* God and sinners reconciled—an article of my creed is that this coming of the Lord is at hand.

Adeste, fideles,
Laeti triumphantes,
Venite, venite in Bethlehem ;
Natum videte
Regem Angelorum :
Venite adoremus Dominum.

APPENDIX TO VIII

(Easter 1914)

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD AND THE LIBERAL CLERGY

Dr. Gore has lately written to the clergy of his diocese an Open Letter. It covers forty-six pages. Of these, twenty-five pages deal with the Liberal Clergy. The Bishop finds, as for many years he has

found, that the position of the 'advanced' critical school within the clerical ranks is untenable, is, in fact, fundamentally immoral. 'The conclusions which I shall express,' he says, 'will be almost exactly those expressed by . . . the late Henry Sidgwick.'

The conclusions expressed by the late Henry Sidgwick it is the aim of my last preceding article to qualify and, in some important points, to refute. Dr. Gore hardly meets, he partly ignores, these qualifying and refuting arguments; which in that article receive individual utterance, but which among Liberal Clergy are variously and commonly maintained. On one issue he comes to close quarters, and I will now, with great respect, briefly examine therein his contention.

In the Apostles' Creed are three allied historical statements: (1) 'He descended into hell'; (2) 'The third day he rose again from the dead'; (3) 'He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God.' Liberal Clergy hold that these three statements are akin, and that the symbolical interpretation which confessedly has obtained concerning (1) and (3) shall, if the ultimate verdict of competent criticism so direct, be applied to (2). Dr. Gore peremptorily forbids. No! he warns us; the process of symbolical interpretation must stop sharply and finally at (1) and (3); to (2) it can never reach. For this surprising and, as it at once appears, arbitrary distinction Dr. Gore proceeds to give his reasons. He declares that (1) and (3) regard matters 'outside present human experience,' and that, concerning these, 'we can only . . . formulate our beliefs in

symbolical language'; but that (2) regards matters 'within human experience,' and that here, therefore, a symbolical interpretation is precluded.

This is a *theory*—a theory which somehow has satisfied this noble and gifted man, but which on the face of it bears the marks of unconscious caprice; it is autobiographical, of no general validity. It is, I venture to think, triply unsound. (a) It is not true that belief concerning the Descent and the Ascension-with-the-Session was *originally formulated*, as Dr. Gore asserts or implies, in 'symbolical language.' The foundation of this belief was eminently literal, not symbolical. The writers of the New Testament and the compilers of the Creed thought and spoke of the Descent and of the Ascension-with-the-Session in an archaic, naïve, materially objective manner; they meant to affirm concrete happenings, and to affirm them literally. The symbolism arose not in the early formulation, but in the later interpretation. In the light of growing knowledge it was found that the old literal interpretation was impossible; then the phrases gradually, against long and conscientious orthodox discomfort and protest, took on to themselves a symbolical meaning. Men no longer *could* believe that hell was, in Dr. Gore's words, 'a hollow place under the ground'; nor that heaven 'is over our heads, and [that] God the Father has there a throne where the Son literally sits on His right hand.' No; men could no longer believe this. So, instead of changing the *words* of the Creed, they changed its *interpretation*. The language was made to strike new notes; its suggestions became ultra-phenomenal. The significance

of the terms was made to expand, until it embraced the new heaven and the new hell which correspond to modern man's apprehensions of ultimate Good and Evil. *Idem aliter*. Old words; new meanings, symbolical meanings. M. Auguste Sabatier has clearly shown that to this susceptibility of developing, heterogeneous, figurative *interpretation* is due the stubborn vitality of dogmas. Thus the Credal language concerning the Descent and the Ascension-with-the-Session was *not* originally, and therefore need not necessarily, be symbolical; and point one of Dr. Gore's theory fails. (b) Point two of the theory fails also. Vain is the proffered distinction between the Resurrection, on the one hand, as 'within human experience,' and, on the other hand, the Descent and the Ascension-with-the-Session as 'outside present human experience.' This proffered distinction is even, one ventures to say, futile. Originally, as we have seen above, the Resurrection, the Descent, and the Ascension-with-the-Session were, all three, affirmed and interpreted literally, and were, all three, thought to fall 'within human experience.' In our own time all three Events have come, or are coming, to be interpreted symbolically; and are, all three, thought in their mystic reality to fall 'outside present human experience.' In either case, then and now, the three Events stand on the same mental and experiential level. For instance, the Resurrection Body, whether of Westcott's 'Manifestations' or of Weizsäcker's 'Christophanies,' is as great a mystery as is the Ascension Body. (c) Point three, assumed throughout the theory, is equally fallacious. It is

this. The belief in a sensible, real, objective Resurrection of our Lord is, we are told, worthless without a belief in the actual resuscitation of the buried Body. 'The third day It rose again from the dead'; we must, on pain of virtual excommunication, in effect hold that. Without it our position, 'looked at in the light of common morality, proves utterly unjustifiable.' In reply, I can only say that, for one who, while not finally rejecting the traditional view, keeps a mind open to modern readings of our Lord's Resurrection—for such a one the Easter Sacrament, the Easter Scriptures, the Easter hymns and anthems gather a magnificent new potentiality and promise; they have put on strength; they themselves (be it spoken with reverence) were dead, and behold, they are alive for evermore.

I have shortly, summarily investigated Dr. Gore's theory in relation to the Resurrection. It might likewise be investigated, and be found equally wanting, in relation to the Incarnation. For our brief purpose this is unnecessary, since Dr. Gore declares: 'The belief in the resurrection is more central to the Christian faith than the belief in our Lord's birth of a virgin.'

Dr. Gore's theory thus appears to the present writer, if he may say so, to be desperate and void.¹ Even taken at its best, even to its ardent supporters, it is fearfully precarious. And yet what is to hang from it? from this attenuated and frangible thread?

¹ The writer has read Dr. Gore's elaboration of his theory in the *Constructive Quarterly*, March 1914, and remains wholly unconvinced.

Nothing less—you almost tremble at the precipitancy—than the future of the Christian Church !

And in accord with this theory, in subservience to it, on the basis of Dr. Gore's implacable distinction between those cognate articles in the Creed, there is to be a Resolution of Anglican Bishops¹ repudiating the 'advanced' Critical Clergy and warning off the precincts of the Ministry 'advanced' critical candidates.

Meanwhile the mighty glacier of Biblical Criticism pursues its silent, awful way through the generations, 'from Reimarus to Wrede,' and will pursue—torpid, grinding, irresistible. You would stay it, or deflect, with episcopal Dicta ! They are pebbles in its path. At the appropriate, ponderous moment it will crush them unnoticed into dust.

Ah ! Dr. Gore, Bishop indeed, it is hard for some of us to contend, sir, with you. We owe you too much. From youth we have read your writings and have listened to your sermons ; perhaps we have drunk in the wonderful spirit of your quiet Retreats in Keble College and Chapel. The Banner of Christ, held on high before this English people, has not drooped or wavered in your hands. But, sir, more commanding even than deference to a saintly man is loyalty to a great cause. And great for us is the cause of Clerical Liberalism. It too, like your own Anglo-Catholicism, is a glimmer, vitally needed in our day, of the Light Eternal.

¹ See Introduction.

PART II
PRACTICAL

IX

PUBLIC JUDGMENT AGAINST THE FATAL OPULENCE OF BISHOPS

(A Letter to the *Guardian*, 19th June 1901)

SIR,—Considerable discussion in the Press has been hung from a humble peg—a volume published by me early this year and named *The Fatal Opulence of Bishops*.

Some forty journals have considered the subject, *i.e.* the present style of residence, stipend, and title of our diocesan Bishops. All but four or five favour some measure of reform, or at least some examination of reforming needs and possibilities. This is true, though some of the journals qualify their approval with many reservations, and several almost stifle it with much dissent. It is true, moreover, of deliberate and weighty publications like *Literature* and the *Spectator*, as well as of champions of more impetuous change such as are the *Speaker*, the *Daily Chronicle*, the *Westminster Gazette*. It is true also of the Press both of great provincial

towns — Liverpool, Bradford, Sheffield, Newcastle, Nottingham, Bristol, Aberdeen, Glasgow ; and of large provincial districts — Yorkshire, South Wales. But we will focus our observation upon seven leading and varied newspapers of the English Church, whose declared consensus in favour of some amendment is as surprising as it is notable and welcome.

1. The *Guardian*, in a leading article, says :

No earnest Churchman can read Mr. Handley's book without much sympathy, and few save those who are blinded by conservatism will fail to go some distance with him, even if they cannot travel the whole road. . . . Exaggerated though we think Mr. Handley's contention to be, we still feel that he has made out a very strong case for greater simplicity. Things have already moved a little in that direction, and they will continue to move further, and if Mr. Handley has accelerated the pace we shall not complain. It has been found possible for a Bishop to exist on £3000 a year and a house, instead of £5000 a year and a palace ; it is improbable that any new See will ever boast a 'palace,' and we would gladly hear the last of that most misleading and infelicitous word.

2. The *Church Times*, in a leading article, says :

We do not altogether agree with Mr. Handley. Yet we have great sympathy with his contention. . . . As things now are the Bishop might with advantage be

relieved of all expenditure which is not strictly personal to himself, his nominal income being proportionately reduced. We suggest this advisedly, as things now are ; we do not propose it as an ideal arrangement. . . . It is the course which is followed in settling the Royal Civil List. We should welcome its adoption in episcopal finance.

3. The *Record* says :

With his main contention we have much sympathy. . . . But to part with the old See houses is not so simple a matter. Perhaps Mr. Handley's book may help to its solution. It wants solving ; for when it is once understood that a prelate can live in modest style, the argument for episcopal incomes of from £4000 to £10,000 a year can hardly be sustained. The big house suggests or compels a style which makes the proper hospitality of a Bishop far more costly than it need be. By all means let the stipends of the Bishops be ample . . . but let us stay the waste which circumstances at present almost compel.

4. The *Church Review*, enthusiastic and bel-ligerent for reform, says :

Our whole system is false in these respects. From a world saturated with the pride of wealth we have accepted the idea of the necessary proper style for clergy and dignitaries. We fervently agree with Mr. Handley's wisdom in appealing to the Bishops. It is impossible to expect to move the clergy so long as those who are set over them in the Lord do not initiate or accept herein reform.

5. The *Pilot* says :

We have no dislike to halving the incomes and burdens of the Bishops . . . as part of a well-considered system of Church administration.

6. The *Church Family Newspaper* says :

We are quite of opinion that with less state and smaller income the Bishops would do just as good work . . . and such conditions would certainly make it infinitely easier to establish new bishoprics in the populous centres where they are very urgently needed.

7. A communicated article in the *Commonwealth* largely demurs, yet says :

One real point is the wide hindrance to the effort of the Church by the difficulties of the increase of the episcopate. . . . And ' it is a scandal ' that Government inaction, public apathy, and the supposed necessity for an immense endowment should be thus rendering the episcopal system impossible in London and the great cities of England.

No Church paper, so far as I am aware, has written in the opposite sense.

The correspondence published in certain Church papers, *e.g.* in the *Guardian* and the *Church Times*, is for the most part reformatory.

Such incentives to reform would in some realms of grievance probably evoke from our

FATAL OPULENCE OF BISHOPS 157

Fathers in God debate and, it might be, remedy. We respectfully ask for these results in this realm of grievance. The appeal to the Bishops is for no conventional decision, but for an inquiry, scrutinising, capacious, exhaustive, open-minded, obstinately just. Imagine it arising; imagine, further, that their judgment went for greater simplicity, for reduction of income, for sacrifice of the insignia and the mien of the temporal grandee—at the bare and hinted prospect the pulse quickens, the temples beat with love and gratitude, and who shall gauge the magnificent added momentum of our spiritual message to this bluff and generous English people? ‘*Dominus autem augebat qui salvi fierent quotidie in idipsum.*’

Not in our time, cool persons reply, will these hopes be realised. They may not; it is relentlessly true. On the other hand, they may. Professor Harnack, in his eminent lectures to his 600 students of Berlin University during the winter of 1899-1900, utters relevant words:

The Lord’s injunction that the minister of the Word is to divest himself of worldly possessions will still come to be honoured in the history of His communion. . . . At the very least, it ought to be a strict principle with them to concern themselves with property and

158 PUBLIC JUDGMENT AGAINST THE

worldly goods only so far as will prevent them being a burden to others. . . . Our feelings in this respect are becoming finer, and that is an advantage.

Whether these hopes will be realised in this generation, or only in a later, we, the hopeful, do not know. In either case we are at ease, serene, in our minds. And for this reason. We believe that the reform, at its bidden time, will come ; for that behind it, as behind every other humblest step forward in the great and gradual and silent march of righteousness, is a force which sooner or later has to be taken account of—omnipotence.

HUBERT HANDLEY.

APPENDIX TO IX

(January 1914)

A DECADE OF EPISCOPAL INACTION

In this matter what have the Bishops done ? What during the past ten or twelve years ? Have they taken any common action ? Have they in the many episcopal gatherings debated the affair ? Have they entered it on the list as an affair of debate ? Have they together looked it in the face ? Acknowledged the bare existence of the difficult and urgent problem ? No. Over and over again, in countless connections,

at all angles, episcopal speech in episcopal assembly has explored other concerns of the Church. It has ignored this concern. The Upper House of Convocation has ignored it. The prelates in the House of Lords have ignored it. The Lambeth Conference of 1908, counting 242 Bishops and reviewing almost everything else, ignored it. Individual Bishops generally ignore it or treat it with a superficiality, sometimes with a levity, than which silence itself would be better. One Bishop of Worcester during the period, Dr. Gore, has worthily renounced a castle and occupied a house; another Bishop of Worcester succeeding, Dr. Yeatman-Biggs, with inverted repentance has renounced the house and reoccupied the castle. The words and deeds herein of our fathers in God alike are astounding and intolerable. Affable remonstrance pales and fails; we need protests plain and fierce.

At the Church Congress of 1912 the Archbishop of York, presiding over an audience of men, is reported (the *Guardian*, 4th October 1912) to have spoken thus :

As regards being idle, my conscience is very clear. . . . When it comes to being rich, I do not feel my conscience quite as easy. I am not prepared to defend the system which we have inherited in the possession of responsibilities that are given to our Bishops. But I ask you just to remember neither the Bishop of London nor I have created that great burden of expensive responsibility that is put upon our shoulders. We have not sought it; all we can do is to try to make the best use of it. A great deal more than a third of what I have goes out to meet the constant claims of a Diocese such as this. The rest of it goes to

maintaining the house—much larger than I want, but which as long as I am bound to live in it I want to make a great home of the Diocese.’

‘I am not prepared to defend the system!’ ‘We have not sought it!’ ‘All we can do is to try and make the best use of it!’ ‘As long as I am bound to live in it!’ What? Who says that? Amid the fierce honesties of our day; amid the grim determination of the on-coming democracy to get at facts—who dares to utter unrealities like that? To equivocate and evade? To trifle with an immense discredit? ‘All we can do is to try and make the best use of it.’ What have you tried to do? You lately launched a scheme of financial investigation; you appointed an ‘Archbishops’ Committee on Church Finance.’ Did you write examination of this hot, flaming wrong in the first line of the agenda? Was this No. 1 in the terms of reference? Did you not, by an incredible lapse, shut out from the inquiry precisely this, the primary and dominating abuse? ‘All we can do.’ What have you tried? Have you resolved on simplicity and reform? Have you in this behalf harangued Parliament? Have you beaten at the doors of the Ecclesiastical Commission with such unanimity and vigour that they opened to your honourable insistence? Have you agitated? Held meetings to demand a rectification? Marched out for this with banners into the Park? Have you led crusades for this inspiring surrender of mundane riches and glory? Have you converted the hearts of congresses towards this unworldliness? Have you commanded the conscience of the observing, outside multitude with a

FATAL OPULENCE OF BISHOPS 161

single note from the great chord of Apostolic poverty ? 'All we can do.' It is not true. You have not tried. You have clung to the trappings of the earthly magnate ; you have remained rooted in your palaces. You have sat there, offending and content, within the obsolete chambers of ecclesiastical pride. You have looked out from your feudal windows with the eyes of a strange indocility. You have barred your immoderate coffers with the bolts of an awful impenitence. This is what you have done ; and you have done it deliberately, in face of the imploring or the imprecating spirits of purification. The people know your default. The personal goodness of many among you cannot hide it, cannot cure it. The people know that with your temporal pretensions you have dug between you and them a moral gulf. They think of you as foreign to themselves, as foreign, moreover, to your own high calling. When they see you in the street they see a stranger ; they see, too, a figure of this world, averse from the unearthly biddings and potencies of the Gospel. The leader of the Labour Party tells you in the House of Commons, on 13th May 1912, his estimate. 'I do not know,' he says, 'how Lord Hugh Cecil feels in regard to great Church dignitaries, but to me they are an offence both in the sight of God and man. When one looks at a Bishop with all the regalia and paraphernalia of their assumption of position and place, and contrasts them with the Galilean working man whose creed they profess to serve, it stamps the State Church as being alien to religious purposes.'

Here, reverend sirs, the voice of the people is the voice of God. Their instinctive repugnance to your

162 FATAL OPULENCE OF BISHOPS

garish circumstances ; their restrained and patient anger ; their implacable dissent—these tempers are tokens, flashes, (be it said with reverence) sacraments of the divine wrath. And sooner or later the cry herein of the suffering Church against her leaders will be answered from on high, ‘ *Put my tears into Thy bottle : are not these things noted in Thy book ?* ’

X

THE WRONG OF EPISCOPAL FINANCE

(A Paper read before the Church Congress, Great
Yarmouth, 1st October 1907)

Gold ?

This yellow slave

Will knit and break religions.

Timon of Athens.

THE ESTRANGED POPULACE

ON the evening of last Easter Day, Mr. Keir Hardie addressed the Independent Labour Party in Conference at Derby. He professed his faith. 'Socialism,' he said, 'is the human religion of the twentieth century, bringing hope into the weary, grey, and sordid lives of men.'¹ The aim is noble, and is well spoken : 'to bring hope into the weary, grey, and sordid lives of men.' It even recalls the lofty and pathetic tones of Newman's great sermon, 'The Church a Home for the Lonely.'

Who is Mr. Keir Hardie ? And why, for

¹ The *Times*, 1st April 1907.

164 WRONG OF EPISCOPAL FINANCE

purposes so humane, does he not look to the Church ?

Mr. Keir Hardie, though his political map no doubt needs correction, is a herald—a herald of a mighty, coming power ; and behind his earnest and warning notes you hear the tramp, nearer and more near, of advancing Democracy. Alas ! too, he represents the democratic temper in that he ignores the Church ; in that he brings not the banner of his ideals within her sacred walls for help and benediction. That aloofness is now the habit of the multitude, who, though not hostile, regard the Church with notorious unconcern.

THE CLASS DISTINCTION OF THE CHURCH

Why are the workmen of England not at home in the Church of their fathers, as, say, in the thirteenth century they were ? The causes of their alienation are many. Let us note one ; let us not blink it ; let us not attenuate its rebuke. It is this. The working people, while granting on our part vast charitable activity towards the poor, yet reckon our Church as at heart an upper class affair ; yet reckon us clergy in the main as siding with the well-to-do, as viewing the landscape of life from within the

enclosure of privilege, as approaching the masses in the *esprit de corps* of the classes. Hear two incorruptible judges. The great Lord Shaftesbury, as he hewed his way through the wood of social wrongs, thus recorded against the clergy their defect: 'So it has ever been with me; at first I could get *none* [of the clergy to help]; at last I have obtained a few, but how miserable a proportion of the entire class! The ecclesiastics . . . are great worshippers of wealth and power.'¹ And to-day, though the Angel of Penitence is among us, Mr. Charles Booth nails on the church doors this grave verdict: 'With the rich and fashionable the Established Church, up to a certain point, has an easy task. . . . In parishes of the wage-earning class . . . all branches of the Church of England fail alike.'²

ESPECIALLY EPISCOPAL AFFLUENCE

Where does this class bias of our Church accumulate? Where does the stamp of our mundane superiority stand out most red and provocative? Respectfully, the answer is: In

¹ Hodder's *Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury*, vol. ii. p. 76.

² *Life and Labour of the People in London; Religious Influences*, vol. vii. pp. 44, 47 (compressed).

the palaces, in the wealth, in the temporal rank of our Diocesans. Let the Bishop of London speak. (We London clergy, permit me to say, hold our Bishop in high regard, and just now our prayers for him, like the sea birds, follow his ship to and fro on the great Atlantic waters.) He writes: 'Who does not know that to working men Bishops constitute a Church difficulty? Who . . . has not heard, for the thousandth time, scorn passed . . . above all, upon the state and pomp and luxury in which the modern Bishop is supposed to live?'¹ A Nonconformist expert in the same study confirms that judgment thus: 'The masses sub-consciously believe that a large [ministerial] stipend is not in harmony with the teaching and example of Jesus Christ.'²

Before projecting definite reforms, let me make two indefinite remarks—

(i) I venture to utter a profound regret that our Fathers in God do not appear together to have debated, with any ardour and insistence, a reduction of episcopal revenues. In other and humble assemblies—of clergy, of laity, of workmen—in private talk, in the Press, that topic

¹ *Church Difficulties*, p. 50 (compressed).

² R. Mudie-Smith's *The Religious Life of London*, p. 7.

of late years often has been hot, prominent, and importunate ; it is barely discernible in the memoranda of Convocation.

(ii) With all the loyalty and passion of my being I beg our Fathers in God to face and grip this problem. The opportunity is superb. Forty years ago the nobles, the *samurai*, of Japan made a great sacrifice ; ‘ all the lords of the fiefs surrendered of their own accord their domains and people ’ ¹ to the nation ; and that act of abnegation was a potent ingredient in the revival and grandeur of modern Japan. And now, could the great ecclesiastics of England make a like surrender, who can measure the fecundity, the packed promise for good to this Church and nation, of that deed ? Mr. Philip Snowden, Labour Member of Parliament for Blackburn, lately expressed to me this acute, notable opinion : ‘ The common people have so lost faith and interest in the Church that, in order to win back their love, there will have to be on the Church’s part some almost ostentatious act of renunciation.’ May we Churchmen meet a challenge like that in ‘ valour and charity ’ ! ² May our Bishops, at the Lambeth

¹ Statement prepared by the Ministry of Finance in *Japan by the Japanese*, p. 344.

² Tennyson to the Rev. F. D. Maurice.

Conference or elsewhere, spread out this whole matter, in awful probity, for judgment before the Lord !

DETAILS OF REMEDY

We come to details: from aspiration to arithmetic.

The episcopal estates are vested in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The revenues from time to time have been pooled and re-adjusted by special Acts of Parliament and Orders in Council. The actual stipends, etc., to-day of the various Sees—except new creations like Truro or Birmingham—were fixed by Order in Council in the year 1851. The ‘permissive Act’ which often has been sought would spare us those fitful and particular applications to Parliament, and would probably grant to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners an abiding general control. Until that lacking ‘permissive Act’ is gained, the machinery for revenue reform is indeed cumbrous; yet the power is attainable, and the precedents suffice. The only radical question is: What improvement do we want? and what is the driving force of our desires?

QUIT THE PALACE

(i) We want the disuse, as an abode, of the palace. We desire that palaces, as private dwellings of Ministers of Christ, shall unitedly, deliberately, and for good be abandoned. The harm of the palace is double. (a) It compels expense. It is a comet dragging behind it the necessary tail of a big income. It is a hungry mouth demanding and devouring most of the Bishop's money. The coal and gas bill for Fulham Palace and London House was, in the famous balance-sheet, £379, 9s. 5d.; and there were shown eleven servants for the thirty-two bedrooms at Fulham and seventeen bedrooms in London House, besides thirteen outdoor men-servants for the gardens, farm, and stables. The palace spells *profusion*. (b) The palace is a fortress of class distinction, which, on the one hand, keeps the crowd at a distance, and, on the other hand, fences its occupant round, shutting him off from a share in the pathos and glories of the common human lot. The palace spells *caste*.

The palace, then, is the root evil of our embarrassments. Not that we, who thus think, are dull to its enchantment. The grey walls and lichens; the quiet library and garden

170 WRONG OF EPISCOPAL FINANCE

shade ; the perfume of holy association and of earlier England ; the benignity of the old homes of the Bishops—ah ! they are almost sacramental in their beauty. But to issue from their feudal gates for the conversion of our teeming industrial England to-day—is that to read the signs of the times ? We might as fitly preach to the Seven Dials in Latin. Therefore, with decision, though not without a pang, we plead with our Fathers in God that the summons of the age to them is this : Quit the palace !

We cannot now stay to sort the varieties of pious use to which the palace, once freed from the insinuations of pride, might well be put—whether as Home of Rest for Clergy, or Training College for Clergy, or Library for Clergy (after Mr. Gladstone's dream), or Church House of the Diocese, or otherwise. We only utter the hope that these historic fabrics will remain in the salutary tenure of the Church.

A STIPEND OF £1500

(ii) What of the stipends ? They mean much. 'That threepence,' said Lord Acton of Lord North's American Tea Tax, 'broke up the British Empire.'¹ What, in our time, is the fit

¹ Lord Acton's *Lectures on Modern History*, p. 310.

income for a Bishop ? To this rude, inevitable question the answers have been abundant and mixed. There was the concise plan of the great Bishop Selwyn : ‘ Double our numbers and halve our incomes.’¹ There was the plan of the Marquess of Blandford, who, so long ago as 1852, drafted a Bill in Parliament to provide sixteen or eighteen new Sees at a stipend of £2500 each, and to reduce the stipend of the See of Canterbury to £10,000, of York to £8000, of London to £6000, of Durham and Winchester to £5000 each.² There was the plan, two years ago, of the Leeds Clergy Union, who unanimously suggested fifty-four new Bishoprics of £1000 each, with £100 for a house.³ There is a plan not to fix for a Diocese a ‘ maximum wage ’ at all, but to pool the existing episcopal revenues, and to divide the pooled total among rearranged Dioceses—one for every county (as wished by the historian Freeman), or one for every archdeaconry. There is a plan (wholly inadequate, it seems) to let alone the present stipends, but to rule that part, say half, only be available for private use, and that the other

¹ A letter in the *Guardian*, 18th January 1905.

² C. E. A. Bedwell’s *The Increase of the Episcopate*, pp. 20, 21.

³ The *Times*, 5th January 1905.

172 WRONG OF EPISCOPAL FINANCE

half be spent, and be accounted for, in Diocesan administration and alms.

A last plan is the one which I venture to commend, as inducing, without violence, the minimum of wanted change. It is grounded on proposals of the Lower House of Convocation in the year 1861, Dr. Christopher Wordsworth (not yet Bishop of Lincoln) presiding—proposals shelved, alas! by the Upper House.¹ It is this. The normal income of a Diocesan Bishop shall be £1500, house and all included. The thirty-seven old Sees, when rid of the prodigal palaces, can thrive on that revenue, except that Winchester, Durham, London, York, Canterbury might rise by gradation to £3000—*i.e.* to about the stipend of the Bishop of New York. A surplus of some £110,000 would thus be shed, which might afford £1500 a year to fifty new Sees, and might also find something to eat for the starved livings. No effort less than that will right us.

BISHOPS IN A SENATE

(iii) What of the Bishops as legislators? That Christian ministers should sit as Lords Spiritual in an aristocratic chamber, robed in

¹ C. E. A. Bedwell's *The Increase of the Episcopate*, pp. 30, 31.

advantage, this, after all feats of excuse, remains intractably unfit. On the other hand, nothing could be more becoming than that, as in Lord Newton's Bill, elect Bishops, with leaders of other communions, should sit in a Senate as sentinels of righteousness.

THE ONE THING NEEDFUL

In all these amending policies details shift. Facile fingers run up and down the scales of change, and the reforming tunes are varied. The only thing that matters is that there should be a daring and wholesale episcopal sacrifice toward a humbler status and a simpler life. Single Bishops have offered willingly parts of their incomes and homes ; what the times crave is a general and concerted surrender. It would open the doors to our countrymen's belief. 'Ye Russian people,' cries the educated man in Turgenieff's novel,¹ 'unknown of us, but loved with all our being, teach us what from you we must expect !' And we clergy of the Church of God within this land cry : 'O loved and downright English folk, tell us the way to your heart !'

¹ *Virgin Soil.*

VERACITY AND HOPE

There are two concluding points.

(i) This paper attacks a system, not individuals. On the one hand, the evils I dare not palliate. The danger is too impressive, the honour of the Church is too commanding, the mood of this audience is too sincere, for trifling. It is a time for truth, for fierce veracity. On the other hand, we must keep that high personal allegiance to our Fathers in God which by their Consecration they claim and by our Baptism we owe.

(ii) Finally, for all our difficulties, some of us abound in hope. At the entrance to the Naval College at Osborne runs this inscription : ‘ There is nothing the Navy cannot do.’ Read with a glint of humour and patriotism, that motto is not bombast—it is a cheerful word of readiness and intrepidity. Let us borrow it, O soldiers of the Cross ! If mentally and socially we will throw off anachronisms and face the age, if we will step out into the new era contrite and consistent, then from the pit of failure a flag, dipped though it be in suffering, will go up and unfurl the legend exultant—‘ The Lord of Hosts is with us ; there is nothing the Church cannot do !’

XI

A DAILY BREAD MISSION TO
THE RICH

(The development of a Plan briefly proposed to the London Diocesan Conference, 1909; published in the *Contemporary Review*, April 1914)

INTEMPERANCE marshals its forces among us in at least two divisions. There are: (1) Alcoholic intemperance, or intoxication with drink; (2) Voluptuous intemperance, or intoxication with pleasure. Of the first the ravages are familiar; they are painted in every pulpit and on every platform. The second scatters its injuries less perceptibly, but perhaps with equal ruin. Inwardly, voluptuous intemperance is based on a false view of life; of life not as 'a great and noble calling,' but as a prolonged meal in triviality, where the jaded appetite must ever be moved with some new sensation and selfishness. Outwardly, voluptuous intemperance uses up untold national labour for its own mean purpose, diverting attention and energy from

the ends of national sanity, honour, rectitude, might.

Between these two modes of intemperance, alcoholic and voluptuous, there are secondary distinctions.

(a) Speaking roughly and approximately, alcoholic intemperance is the specific temptation of the working classes; voluptuous intemperance is the specific temptation of the wealthy.¹ But the Christian Church—if it means anything, if it is not evacuated of its unearthly and commanding significance—looks through the class at the man; and as it can protect the poor man from his temptation, so it can protect the rich man from his.

¹ Of course, no clear-cut moral line can be drawn between the strata of society. There are sober poor and sober rich; drunken rich and drunken poor; both poor and rich, who are idle and self-indulgent; both rich and poor, who are exemplary in diligence and self-control. But while the evil of drunkenness is, on the moral map, coloured darkest among the poor and shades off into light tints among the prosperous, the evils of excessive pleasure are coloured darkest among the prosperous and graduate among the poor to comparative paleness.

Of course, too, no clear-cut economic line can be drawn between the strata of society. It is not easy to say precisely who are rich and who are poor. The transition from the one section to the other is gradual; in a scientific treatise the boundaries would be defined. But for the purpose of this essay the conventional division into rich and poor or into working and wealthy classes, loose though it be and inexact, is apt and sufficient.

(b) Alcoholic intemperance is declining ; the evidence is ample and welcome. Voluptuous intemperance is growing ; the evidence is abounding and intolerable. From a crowd of witnesses to this latter fact take a few.

Sir Chandos Leigh in his recent volume, *Bar, Bat, and Bit*, utters this striking lament :

‘ The home life of my early days is entirely changed, if it has not utterly disappeared. The cult of the *lares* and *penates*, which marked the most flourishing days of the Roman Republic, has given way to a corybantic pursuit of pleasure and excitement.’

Viscount Bryce, a traveller of rare authority, lately lectured at the University of London on ‘ Salient Educational Issues.’ He reported this point against our younger commercial class (the *Times*, 3rd January 1914) :

‘ Wherever one travelled abroad—in Mexico, in South America, in the Far East—one found the heads of our firms complaining that the English youths who came out to them showed less interest in their work than did their competitors from the European continent. The latter took pains to master the economic facts of the country. They learnt its language. They did not spend their time in amusement

as soon as they quitted the counting-house in the afternoon, but worked at subjects profitable for their business. This, more than anything else, was the reason why foreign competitors had been gaining upon us in many markets.'

Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., in his paper read before the Church Congress in 1913, formulated for the hundredth time the charge (the *Labour Leader*, 9th October) :

'The evidences of selfish indulgence in luxury which meet one's eyes everywhere show the demoralising effect of riches on those who possess them.'

Dr. H. B. Gray in his arresting book, *The Public Schools and the Empire*, has lately placarded before those who have eyes to see the 'ominous resemblance,' again and again noted by other patriots, between the commencing decay of ancient Rome and certain morbidities of modern England—'the same growth of luxury and desire for bodily comfort; . . . the same love of display in social life.'

The Bishop of London raps the nail on the head. Speaking in the Upper House of Convocation, 7th May 1909, with particular refer-

ence to betting and gambling,¹ he declared (the *Times*, 8th May) :

‘ People hardly realised how much in some ways the nation was going down in character.’

A representative body of Churchmen, clerical and lay, insists on the same ill-omens. At the London Diocesan Conference held in April 1909 the following resolution was unanimously, or, at least, *nemine contradicente*, carried (the *Guardian*, 5th May) :

‘ That this Conference protests against the luxury, extravagance, and undue regard for pleasure often, though by no means always, found among the wealthier classes, and urges that practical measures be adopted to promote a simpler life, in order to lift the national habits into higher planes of self-denial and service for the common good.’

A note of practical remedy, or, at any rate, a call for downright grappling with this ugly

¹ An obscure and remote group of Britons, lacking the dignity and prestige and high Christian assumption of the Upper House of Convocation, lately was more direct and courageous in its endeavour. ‘ The Grand Jury of York County, Ontario, in their presentment yesterday asked that His Majesty and Lord Grey should withhold their patronage from race-courses while public betting is allowed. Judge Winchester concurred, adding that gambling was the greatest evil in England to-day’ (the *Times*, 7th June 1909).

evil among us, was sounded by the Bishop of Manchester, as President of the Church Congress, 1908 (the *Guardian* report); a call which, however, has not yet resounded, as it ought, with a consenting shout throughout our organised Christian ranks :

‘ I suggest that our religious revival [of the twentieth century] may take the form of a Mission to the wealthy.’

(c) Exactly at this point is exposed the neglect, the nullity, the shame of the Church—of the Church in the wide sense,¹ Anglican, Roman, and Free.² To meet the particular and

¹ ‘ The Christian Church is at once a vague and a strictly definite word. It is sometimes equivalent simply to “ Christendom ” ’ (Dean Church on ‘ The Christian Church,’ in Oxford House Papers).

² First hand and painfully complete is in this matter my knowledge of the Anglican fault: my own loved Church is probably the superlative culprit. But the other Christian Communion, too, appear to fail. Who does not honour the Christian force in many respects of the great Nonconforming Churches? their witness to Conscience? their spiritual fervour? their converting power, especially among the virile, worthy middle class? the variety and scope of their good works? Yet, have they together in our time faced and frightened the sins of the well-to-do? Again, the Roman Catholic Church can show in history magnificent protests against self-indulgence and luxury. That Church can show to-day faithful and touching compassions for the poor. In authority, in age, in dimension, in sacramental genius that Church can boast a grandeur and can cast a spell of its own. But has Roman Catholicism here and now stood up and played the Christian part against influential voluptuousness? Has it shared, has it guided, has it blessed the

manifest harm of alcoholic intemperance the Church has specialised, has concentrated her strength, has evoked into being and driven into action Church Temperance Societies, Bands of Hope, Inebriate Homes, Police Court Missions, Total Abstinence Pledges, Partial Abstinence Pledges, Between Meals Pledges, Support of Licensing Bills, Forward Movements, etc. There has been a righteous and

rising movement of the people against the excesses and abuse of wealth ? Its moral failure here is the spur to the Modernist rebuke. 'Not only are the ancient cathedrals, which the piety of free and faithful peoples in the Middle Ages raised to the Blessed Virgin and to sainted patrons, deserted ; not only do men no longer care to resort to religion for strength and light for their souls, when harassed by everyday fatigues and struggles ; not only have respect and veneration for the sacred things which men learn to love from their cradle disappeared ; but the Church is regarded as an obstacle to the freedom and happiness of peoples, the priest is insulted in the street as a vulgar and obscurantist parasite, the Gospel and Christianity are regarded as expressions of a civilisation which has become obsolete, because of its incompetence to answer to the high ideals of liberty, justice, and knowledge, which are agitating and inspiring the masses' (*What We Want, An Open Letter to Pius X. from a Group of Priests*, translated from the Italian by the Ven. Archdeacon Lilley). So, in the Modernist reply to the Encyclical of Pius x., *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, it is said : 'The official Church's . . . vision of facts is clouded by her ties and attachments to the worldly splendour which she enjoyed in a past age.' So Miss M. D. Petre thrusts the fine rapier of her irony through the clumsy armour of official Roman Catholic pretence, exposing 'such words of Christian hope and joy and exultation in the death of the just as the Cardinal Archbishop [Mercier] had the happiness of uttering in his panegyric of King Leopold of Belgium.'

apt beating of the drums and firing of the cannon. But when it comes to the rich man's fault, to the challenge and effrontery of voluptuous intemperance, the Church, in her corporate capacity, has been mute and apostate. There is abundant in the Church the familiar and tiresome art of polite remonstrance, marked 'not too far,' deferential, toothless; there is, too, the occasional downright word of rebuke, here and there, from some blunt and ignored preacher; but from the whole Church as the City of God, as the Fortress of God, in England—when, in our day, have been sent out John Baptists to face the sins of the powerful? Where, in this corner of the campaign, is the thunder and the truth?

Yet, in days of old, what splendid surrenders did the leading classes of England make for the good of this loved land before God's Altar! 'Writers of the middle ages,' says Hallam, 'compare the knightly to the priestly character in an elaborate parallel, and the investiture of the one was supposed analogous to the ordination of the other. The ceremonies upon this occasion were almost wholly religious. The candidate passed nights in prayer among priests in a church; he received the sacraments;

he entered into a bath, and was clad with a white robe, in allusion to the presumed purification of his life; his sword was solemnly blessed.' More exacting than the knightly vow was the monastic; it claimed from the chief families of our country many candidates, and found in them, as Montalembert affirms, rarely virile brethren, of 'glorious and manful soul.' And the Reforming standard of duty in the Middle Age is held up thus by Wyclif: 'Since God and his preachers have often asked in churches solemnly, that all rich men do truly and wisely give the residue of their goods, over their own sustenance and other needs, in works of mercy to poor feeble lame and blind, they that withhold these goods from these poor men, and waste them in pomp and gluttony and other vanities, fall under the curse.'

The old fire of sacrifice is alive among our English well-to-do to-day. It breaks out in countless sparks.¹ Here is one. 'In the

¹ In the House of Lords, on the 12th of March 1914, Lord Willoughby de Broke moved the second reading of a Bill for the compulsory military service of the well-to-do. Whether or not that measure be practicable, in the debate upon it we heard living echoes of the old superb principle—*noblesse oblige*.

Lord Willoughby asserted 'that the enjoyment of property and comfort was only honourably and morally legitimate so long as it was accompanied by the performance of duty.' 'The kind of

British Army,' said Sir Ian Hamilton, presiding at the annual meeting of the Royal Army Temperance Association, 14th May 1909, 'he thanked God the officer did not say "Go on," but "Come on"; so before he accepted the invitation to preside that day he had taken the pledge for a year (cheers)—really because there were soldier lads joining the Territorials who might be influenced by his example' (the *Times*, 15th May). But sparks are not enough. We want a flame. There are among us innumerable noble rich individuals. We want a noble rich society. The first act in betterment is to hold up the standard high. The Church can do it, if the Church will. The Church can make her appeal first to chosen spirits and can, through them, work on the well-to-do mass. She will demand nothing ascetic, nothing monastic, no blaze of renunciation, no dramatic, Florentine 'Burning of the Vanities'; but, for the national welfare,

people to attack,' he declared, 'were . . . those comfortable people, of whom there was a considerable and growing number, who, as far as he could see, spent every shilling on their own amusement.' The Lord Chancellor said: 'I think it is a fine thing that he [Lord Willoughby] should come forward and say that . . . there is a higher obligation on the rich than on the poor. That is a fine thing' (the *Times*, 13th March).

she from the honourable rich will demand ideals of endurance rather than of ease—that they shall never fail to climb the crags of a difficult and exalted patriotism; she will demand an immense washing of the *nouveaux riches* from their thick, muddy worldliness; she will demand from all a hot disdain of well-to-do vice, vulgarity, greed. She can do it if she will be true to her Flag; if she will not in the presence of Dives bend and bargain and compromise; if she will be human and unflinching in her summons to the opulent conscience.

One forward step would be to proclaim in every well-to-do parish a Mission. It would be only a step; but it would be in the line of our mounting progress. Other like steps have been ordinary Parochial Missions, Temperance Missions, Purity Missions, Street Missions to the Poor. Now hold a *Daily Bread Mission to the Rich*. The resolutions which are a familiar feature in the close of Missions would be shaped for this specific end. And to conclude these proposals, publicly thrown out in the hope that they may engage ecclesiastical attention and debate, here are offered a few samples of resolve:

1. I, a Baptized Member of the Church of Christ, recognising the grand and simple petition in the Prayer of the Faithful for 'Daily Bread,' renounce for myself luxury, extravagance, waste, and display.

2. I hold my property as a trust from God ; and in my outlay I will endeavour (*a*) not to favour unproductive expenditure (*e.g.* for purposes of pride, vanity, or self-indulgence), which uses up labour for barren ends, leaving behind no abiding good ; (*b*) to favour productive expenditure (*e.g.* for purposes of health, religion, education, art, or national honour), which directs labour along fruitful channels for the permanent and common welfare.

3. I believe idleness to be a sin, and avow that God has sent me into the world to do some definite and lifelong work for Him and for my brethren.

4. I will support all manly and womanly sports, pastimes, and amusements which may bring joy and renewal to the toiling lives of the nation ; but I will set my face as a flint against that selfish abandonment to pleasure, that voluptuousness which eats like a canker into the heart of great peoples.

5. Believing that my beloved England is now being urgently beset with these said temptations and perils, I join the Crusade herein for her protection as a humble soldier of the Cross of Christ.

XII

KING EDWARD VII. AND A SIMPLER
NATIONAL LIFE

(An Article in the *Guardian*, 23rd January 1907)

THE influence of the King is immense. The track of his example is unsearchable; down from the throne it descends over widening social steps to the bases of the life of this great people—to the cottage, to the garret, to the homes of toil, to the abodes even of destitution. The rich, who gather round his person, bow to his inclinations and copy his deportment; the poor, distant yet trustful, gaze upon his portrait, study his pursuits, relate to their children the benevolence or the splendour of his public acts. But the King, exalted and lonely on his eminence, may sometimes be beyond the range of warnings of national danger. No one tells him the truth. May the following loyal and uncompromising utterance, published in this journal dedicated to the supreme cause of the

Christian Church, lose its apparent boldness in its real utility !

Pleasure does not save great nations. In its excesses it imperils them. Our beloved country is threatened with the old disease of empires in their prime—with luxury, self-indulgence, and their deadly growths. The evidences crowd around. Six specimens here are chosen.

1. The greatest journal in the land, in the world, is the *Times*. On 6th September 1905 an Englishman of distinction, having dwelt on the Continent since 1892, and having revisited England and France in 1901 and 1905, thus recorded in that newspaper his impressions :

The strongest impression made upon me by my visit [to France] is that France has gone through a process of moral regeneration since the period when I knew it best—that is to say, between 1893 and 1897. . . . I found the ‘moral tone’ of Great Britain far inferior to that of France. . . . [In the England of 1901] the chastening influence of South African disaster, ignominy, and reparative effort was still apparent, and seemed to justify high hopes for the future. To-day it is discouraging to see the lessons of that ordeal still unlearnt, the warnings in great part unheeded, and all classes of the nation bent on gratifying an un-English passion for luxury and excitement. . . . The exaggerations of sport, against which Mr. Kipling pungently protested, are as manifest as ever,

and the ravages of various forms of alcoholism unabated. . . . But the most distressing feature in England to-day is the lack of moral purpose and conviction—purpose and conviction, I mean, such as to inspire steady individual sacrifice for the attainment of the common good. I should scarcely have dared to trust my own impressions had they not been confirmed in a dozen quarters by men whose hands are on the public pulse. One such said, ‘We are in a bad way ; we shall muddle along till serious trouble comes, and then it will be too late. . . .’ Another said, ‘Underneath we are still sound, but we have run to seed, and want two or three years of good stiff adversity to lick us into shape.’ And yet another complained, ‘Despite the Japanese example, we cannot generate any real spirit of everyday devotion to the common good. . . .’ The names of the men who spoke thus would startle many of your readers. . . . Is it not possible for England also to awaken to the love of work and to the need for thoroughness and efficiency ? England has, or had, an immense reserve of moral strength. . . . Cannot this be tapped and turned to account in the service of the Commonwealth ?

2. Throughout the British fleets there is, perhaps, no bolder sailor than Lord Charles Beresford. His prognosis of our national malady is bluntly uttered thus in the *North American Review* for December 1900 :

British society has been eaten into by the canker of money. From the top downwards the tree is rotten.

The most immoral pass before the public as the most philanthropic, and as doers of all good works. . . . This is the danger which threatens the Anglo-Saxon race, . . . the cankering worm in its own heart—the sloth, the indolence, the luxurious immorality, the loss of manliness, chivalry, moral courage, and fearlessness which that worm breeds. This danger which overthrew . . . nations and races in the past, now threatens the race to which we belong.

3. From across the seas, from Greater Britain, the same voice sounds. The veteran Bishop of Christ Church, New Zealand, having lately journeyed to England and returned, is reported thus to have spoken from his own Cathedral pulpit :

It seems to me, after my short stay in England, that English society has broken loose. It was once obedient to religious control, but it has broken loose from that. It was once subject to parental control, but it has broken away from it. It was formerly subject to social control, but it has broken loose from those ties. It once regarded itself as subject to some sort of moral control ; the tendency now is to break away from that. . . . The word 'duty' has gone . . . to the rubbish-heap. . . . [This is] the tendency in a great deal of modern English, or, I might almost say, West End, society.

4. Abused opulence is added poverty. Three plain but responsible citizens of Birmingham,

one of them a mechanic, have lately visited Berlin in order to compare the conditions of life for brassworkers in Berlin and in Birmingham, and have published their observations.¹ Here are extracts from that book :

We visited a [Berlin] parish school in a quarter inhabited by the poorer classes. We saw no case of underfed or untidy children, either in the streets or in the school. . . . We visited a Birmingham Board School. The children were mostly dirty and tattered ; a large number wore very bad boots, not cleaned, and some with soles so dilapidated that the toes showed through. The physique of the children was puny. . . . In comparison with the Berlin School, everything was dirty and untidy. The classes at the Birmingham Technical School are almost entirely confined to the winter months, and in summer are open only twenty-nine days, in comparison with 128 in Berlin. The Berlin brassworkers are fond of good reading, and in their homes they usually possess a small library of good literature. In their amusements the intellectual side finds favour. Slums such as ours do not exist. The general physique and deportment of the people was distinctly a grade higher than one sees at home. The number of persons convicted of drunkenness in Birmingham in 1904 was above thirty times greater than in Berlin in proportion to the respective numbers of the inhabitants. . . . During the ten days of our visit (Easter holidays included) we saw only three

¹ *The Brassworkers of Berlin and of Birmingham.* P. S. King & Son.

drunken persons in the streets ; whereas on Whit Monday in Birmingham, in a train ride of only forty minutes, in broad daylight, we counted six reelingly drunken persons—five men and one woman. The unemployed question is being solved by an uplifting of the unskilled labour market. . . . Mr. Cohen, Secretary of the Brassworkers of Berlin, stated that there was no surplus of unskilled labour out of employment. In travelling through Prussia or Northern Germany one is struck with the condition of the land ; hardly an acre is uncultivated. There are five golf links in Germany, and over one thousand in the United Kingdom.

5. Baron Komura, the eminent Japanese diplomatist, on 23rd July 1905, at St. Paul, Minnesota, U.S.A., is reported by the *Times* to have spoken thus :

The Japanese people could never have won a victory had it not been for three things. In the first place, they were thrice armed by having their quarrel just ; secondly, their entire public service is absolutely free from corrupt practices ; and, lastly, their mode of life has ever been one of such extreme simplicity that their soldiers thus gained equipment for the stress of war. They never could have gained it had they, like too many other nations, abandoned themselves to lives of luxury and sloth, and been unwilling, if not unable, to put their hands to strenuous tasks. Mr. Roosevelt, it would seem, has from the very beginning recognised the value and the truth of the idea

expressed by the philosopher when he referred to plain living and high thinking. The importance of the simple life has in Japan been demonstrated by the whole body of the people.

6. Count K. Hirosawa, a Japanese, educated at an English Public School and at Cambridge, revisiting England after a long absence, is declared by Earl Roberts, speaking at Newcastle-on-Tyne, 8th December 1905, to have said (the *Times*, 9th December):

I notice a distinct and lamentable deterioration in the character, habits, and actions of the English people.

With the King of England lies the superb opportunity to raise herein the Banner of the Right; to discountenance immoderate pleasure in the kingdom; to bridle ostentation; to deter extravagance; to commend to wealthy men the simple life; to call back the rugged virtues; to bid his people hoist ever higher and more high the flag of daily duty, of lofty and resolute effort—not in war, but in peace—to save England. Let us have pageantry, let us have art, let us have sport, fun, pastime, holiday; but let not these things be the choking and deleterious surfeit of a class—let them be the measured and recreating joy of a nation. Not till the clouds of private luxury are dis-

pelled can the sunshine of general happiness appear. The King can give the word. The pampered life, indolence, softness, ease—these and their evil progeny, gambling, intoxication, lust, want—the King can pronounce most potently against them, can lead the moral armies at these prowling, mortal foes. May he, in his majesty, scare them away ! May he confront them ever with his frown, his malediction, his awful and controlling severity !

History whispers warnings. To one such let us hearken. Louis XIV. had died. The French monarchy, men thought, had been buttressed and confirmed by his magnificence. The cracks at the base of that ancient, imposing structure and the coming havoc were descried only by prescient Frenchmen. Montesquieu, the aristocrat, descried them ; the ominous chapter in *L'Esprit des Lois*, named 'Fatale conséquence de luxe à la Chine' (meaning France), was a flash of foreboding genius.

Among the masses of the English people there are rumblings of a like dissatisfaction ; rarely published, more rarely reaching His Majesty's attention, they corroborate the alarms for England which it has been here the painful duty to recount.

Alas ! the Christian Church has often failed the monarch here in rectitude—has failed to tell him the truth. Some of us shudder herein for her vast infidelity. Would that we heard the tones of Bishop Latimer ! Before the noble Edward VI., 19th April 1549, said he :

You that be of the Court, and especially ye sworn Chaplains, beware of a lesson that a great man taught me at my first coming to the Court ; he told me for goodwill ; he thought it well. He said to me, ‘ You must beware, howsoever ye do, that ye contrary not the King ; let him have his sayings ; follow him ; go with him.’ Marry, out upon this counsel ! Shall I say as he says ? Say your conscience, or else what a worm shall ye feel knawing ; what a remorse of conscience shall ye have when ye remember how ye have slacked your duty ! . . . A prince must be turned ; not violently, but he must be won by a little and a little. He must have his duty told him ; but it must be done with humbleness.

The King’s love for England is regal. England is in his blood, derived to him from an incomparable line of sovereign ancestry. We humble citizens cannot gauge the altitude and the force of that princely patriotism. But we, too, love our country, with a love passionate and profound. And with that love is inspired this present cry for the security of England amid her subtle and gathering perils.

APPENDIX TO XII

The note submitting a copy of this article to King Edward, and the King's acknowledgment.

ST. THOMAS'S VICARAGE,
CAMDEN TOWN, N.W.

TO HIS MAJESTY

It has seemed to the writer of the enclosed article more dutiful that he himself should, in respectful loyalty, submit a copy to the King, rather than that the article should possibly come indirectly to His Majesty's attention.

January 23, 1907.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE.

The Private Secretary is commanded by the King to acknowledge the receipt of the Rev. Hubert Handley's letter of the 23rd inst., with the enclosed copy of his Article in the Guardian Newspaper.

26 January 1907.

XIII

A PROPOSED PETITION TO KING EDWARD VII. AGAINST LUXURY

AT a meeting of the Church Conference of the Deanery of St. Pancras, London, held on 27th October 1908, I proposed this motion :

‘ That the following humble Petition be respectfully presented to His Majesty the King :

“ We, the Clergy and Laity of the Church Conference of the Deanery of St. Pancras, N.W., animated with entire devotion to your Majesty’s Throne, but being in close touch with want, unemployment, and misery among your people, desire : (1) to protest with all the fervour and depth of our patriotism against the luxury, the unbounded love of pleasure, the extravagant regard for their own sports and amusements, often, though by no means always, found among the wealthier and leisured classes of our country ; (2) to beg that your Majesty will exert your Royal will and influence upon the richer section

of society, and, through them, upon the whole nation, so as to urge the duty of the simpler life, to fetch back the rugged virtues, to lift the national habits into higher planes of self-denial and service for the common good, and thus by enduring, not temporary and fitful, methods to direct labour along fruitful channels and to alleviate the social woes of England.” ’ ¹

It was objected at the meeting that the Church Conference of St. Pancras was a body too small to project so grave a remonstrance ; and it was suggested that this Conference should forward the motion to the Bishop of London with the request that he would permit it to be proposed at the next session of the London Diocesan Conference. This suggestion I accepted, and I changed the wording ² and the immediate destination of the motion accordingly. So changed, the motion was carried in

¹ A similar motion was proposed by me and seconded by Mr. G. E. Gladstone, Warden of Passmore Edwards Settlement, at a meeting of the Distress Committee of the Borough of St. Pancras, 1st December 1905. The voting was equal, and the motion was lost by the adverse casting vote of the chairman.

² There were now added to the original motion the following words, which appear in the final form of the motion given, by anticipation, pages 198-199 above : ‘ unemployment,’ ‘ though by no means always,’ ‘ Royal will and,’ ‘ to direct labour along fruitful channels and.’

200 PETITION TO KING EDWARD VII.

the St. Pancras Conference by thirty-five votes to twenty-one that the Petition be forwarded to the Bishop of London with the request that he would permit it to be proposed at the next session of the London Diocesan Conference. To the secretary of this latter Conference, therefore, I sent it, with the name of myself as proposer and of a neighbouring vicar as seconder. The request of the St. Pancras Conference so forwarded was declined¹; and the vague protest against luxury² quoted above, page 179, was reluctantly formulated by me instead for the London Diocesan Conference and was carried.

¹ The Hon. Secretary of the London Diocesan Conference informs me that the Council of the Conference, not the Bishop, is responsible for this refusal.

² The renowned soldier, General Count Nogi, in his instructions to the pupils of the Japanese Peers' School, probably killed luxury with this one shot: 'Never indulge in luxury. There is nothing that makes a fool of a man like luxury' (the *Times*, 27th April 1914).

XIV

PAROCHIAL IDEALS

(A Letter to the People of St. Thomas's Parish, Camden Town, N.W., April 1914)

THIS is a humble document. It deals with local affairs, unknown names, obscure duties. In itself it has no right to appear here among matters of large debate.

But Broad Church Clergy are on their trial : they are frequently misunderstood and variously accused. A not uncommon charge against them has been that they neglect their parish work. If at times the insinuation has been true, it is becoming, we believe, progressively false. Broad Church Clergy, in the writer's experience, have caught the ideal of practical service and are devoting themselves in their cures to homely, unremitting toil. The following letter was written to a large poor parish in London without a thought of wider publication. Unstudied and actual, it shows one spot where amid that packed humanity there has been, at

least, Broad Church parochial work. That is all. But, even at the evident risk of seeming egotism, the letter is here dragged out into the light. Paltry and unpardonable, were it adduced for private ends; adduced for public ends, in furtherance of the Liberal Church Cause, it becomes, one may hope, legitimate.

TWENTY YEARS

TO ST. THOMAS'S PEOPLE.—Dear Friends,—Twenty years ago God, Who rules our lives, sent me here to take charge of this parish. I was appointed by the Crown, on the nomination of Mr. Gladstone. I am going now to review those twenty years and to lay before you the additions introduced during that period to the work of the parish. I fear I must talk about myself a good deal. I do not want to do so boastfully at all; but I intend to give a short account of my stewardship.

First of all, I must pay a tribute of respect to my predecessor, the Rev. H. W. Reynolds. He was, I have always understood, a gentle, Christian character; a man of scholarship and study; a man whom to know was to esteem. Nothing I am going to say about changes made since his day in the parish is meant to reproach

him. I discontinued some seven or eight (so far as I can remember or ascertain) of his institutions or works, *e.g.* Evening Communion, District Visitors, Gleaners' Union ; on the other hand, I introduced new work and institutions, as will be seen below. One man organises a parish in one way, another in another. Let each one do his own duty according to his own conscience.

(1) Almost the first important change made was this. I determined that St. Thomas's should have a Second Curate. During the first thirty-one years of the existence of St. Thomas's Church and parish there had been only one Curate. I resolved that there should be two. It was not for the sake of the Church services—a Vicar and one Assistant would be enough for these. It was for the sake of the parish work—visitation of the sick and poor, help to the young in Sunday Schools, Band of Hope, Boys' Brigade, Excursions, etc. There was much difficulty in obtaining the Second Curate. Some of the congregation did not approve, and grants of money from the Ecclesiastical Commission, etc., had stubbornly to be gained. We got up a Petition in favour of a Second Curate, signed by 2439 parishioners and other sup-

porters, and presented it to Headquarters. At last, after a good deal of contest and delay, grants were obtained for £110 a year—£30 or £40 too little. I made myself responsible for this £30 or £40 deficit required each year to make up the Junior Curate's stipend¹; and in the twenty years I find, on examination of the past accounts, that I have paid from my own income for the Second Curate's stipend about £600. It all has been worth while. For without this we should never have seen most of our best Assistant Clergy. We should never have seen or heard of Mr. Kane, Mr. Harre, Mr. Evans, Mr. Steffens, Mr. Engelbach, Mr. Ingoldby, Mr. Comeau, Mr. Milne. All these came as Deacons; and if there had been only one Curate, we could not have had a Deacon. The invaluable work which those Clergy have done among our people justifies, I believe, my determination to find for the parish a Second Curate; and I look back on the reform with quiet thankfulness.

(2) Another change of leading importance

¹ The contributions from the congregation and subscribers towards the Curates' Fund go towards the £30 or £40 deficit on the stipend of the *Senior* Curate. The circumstances have not always been quite the same; but the above statement briefly and substantially represents the facts.

was this. The Church fee for funerals was abolished. The Church was thrown open to all parishioners and members of the congregation in bereavement, so that the Last Service for their dear ones might be held in St. Thomas's among neighbours and friends, without money and without price. The Church ought to be the home of sympathy for troubled souls. As soon as ever a penny of payment passes, the beautiful touch of tenderness is spoilt. And a happy thing it is that the richest and the poorest have gradually come to value this help, and to bring the mortal remains of their departed loved ones as a matter of course into their Parish Church.

I also resolved that on every death in the parish, if desired and circumstances permitted, one of the Clergy should ride with the mourners up to the cemetery and there read the last words of faith and hope at the grave. The Assistant Clergy have done much good work in this way with these 'pilgrims of sorrow.' Many a time I myself have gone. There is hardly a leading family among our workers or congregation that I have not been with on that journey of grief. Rich and poor are here alike. I have gone to Finchley with funerals from the Workhouse,

first brought into our Church. Once I was, with the caretaker from the Lodging House, the only mourner at the funeral from the Infirmary of 'Old Sailor.' I look back on all this quiet work of us three Clergy with thankfulness. It has been, I humbly believe, according to the Heart of the Good Shepherd.

(3) Additions in the actual Services of the Church have been made as follows: Daily Morning Prayer; Holy Communion every Sunday at 8 A.M. (instead of occasionally); at 7 A.M. on great festivals such as Christmas and Easter; on Saints' Days; Choral Communion twice a month; Children's Service once a month; all Lantern Services; Excursion Services before the summer outings; Wednesday Evening Service in Church instead of in Mission Hall, Saturday Evensong, Saturday Evening Prayer Meeting (in Vestry), Special Services in Advent and Lent, Quiet Evening before Palm Sunday, many Special Services in Holy Week, Three Hours' Service on Good Friday, Good Friday Street Procession, Men's Services, Communicants' Guild Service, Monthly Wednesday Evening Foreign Mission Service, Special Temperance Services, Mayor and Borough Council Services, People's Sunday

Evening Services, Railwaymen's Funerals, All-day Intercession on Bank Holidays, Special Corporate Communion for Sunday School Teachers and other Workers, Monthly Prayer Circles.

(4) Two other leading changes in the Church were: (*a*) a Surpliced Choir, the cassocks and surplices being privately given; (*b*) free and open seats established in the Church — the House of God being made entirely the same, as it ought to be, to rich and to poor.

(5) New institutions have been introduced as follows: The Church Council, Mothers' Union, Goose Club, Jumble Sale, Lads' Club, Church History Class, Christmas Carol Singers, Free Will Offerings (inside and outside), House-to-House Collection for Queen Victoria Nurses, Church Army Evangelist for one year in the parish, Rescue Work, two Men's Benefit Societies, Children's Penny Bank, Sunday School Sunday, Sunday School Reunions, Men's Mission Hall Repairing Party, Flower Shows, Elocution Classes, Girls' Health Classes, Dramatic Entertainments, Bank Holiday Teas and Entertainments, Bazaars, Annual Sale of Work, Church of England Men's Society, Volunteer Magazine Distributors, Volunteer Church Furniture Cleaners, Assistant Verger, Lent Self-Denial

Boxes, Waifs' and Strays' Collecting Boxes, Children's Self-Denial Week for Foreign Missions, Collectors for Children's Country Holiday Fund; Vicar representing St. Thomas's Parish on London Diocesan Conference, on Board Schools' Committee, on Borough Distress Committee, on Camden Town Dispensary Committee; Laymen representing St. Thomas's on Ruridecanal Conference, on Federation of Working Men's Clubs, on St. Pancras Public Welfare Association; Children's Sunday Evening Services, Open-air Lantern Services at Workmen's Dwellings, Lodging-house Services and Suppers, Hospital Street Collections, Lend-a-Hand League.

Other institutions, though already in existence twenty years ago, have grown. For instance, the Sidesmen increased in number from 4 to 10; the Working Men's Club from (I think) about 15 members, meeting one night a week, to (at one time) 100 members, meeting six nights a week; the Magazine circulation from between (I think) 200 and 300 to between 500 and 600.

(6) Social gatherings have multiplied. Many of the new institutions have Social Gatherings of their own at Christmastime. Besides these, there have been new 'Socials,' as follows: Choir Suppers, Working Men's Club Suppers,

Policemen and Postmen Suppers, Outcast Dinner, Cinderella Dance, parties for Church Workers at the Mission Hall, at Y.M.C.A., at the Presbyterian Hall, the Drovers' Hall, the New Hall. There have been lectures at several of these Halls. There have been the large dances and the large annual Sunday School Prize-giving at the Baths, Prince of Wales Road.

(7) Summer Excursions have multiplied. Entirely new have been the annual outing to Mr. and Mrs. Howard Vyse at Stoke Place, Choir Excursions, Choir boys to the pantomime, Sunday School Teachers' Excursions, Working Men's Club Excursions, Rambling Excursions. Many of the new institutions, too, have had summer excursions of their own. There have been also special excursions, *e.g.* a party of inspection to Garden City, Letchworth, a party of Choirmen for a week to Paris.

(8) Visitation, especially of the sick and poor, has been a marked feature of our parish work.¹

¹ We were on good terms, of course, with the Nonconformists. A poor Wesleyan woman stated the fact in a spirit of almost Kikuyuan concord, but with some phonetic infelicity. The scene was on my door-step. 'Is the Vicar in?' 'No.' 'You please tell 'im as my 'usband 's ill. 'E 'll come all right. 'E don't mind whether you 're Church, ur Chapel, ur Cath'lic, ur wot. Why should 'e? We 're all a-goin' to the same *gaol*.'

During the nineteen years in which we had a Scripture Reader the parish was, for five days a week, visited about nine hours daily—four hours by the Scripture Reader, two hours each by the Assistant Clergy, one hour by me. The Assistant Clergy and Scripture Reader carefully recorded their visits in a book, and I always read through and discussed with them their book of visits for the past week at our weekly meeting on Monday mornings. Lately I have not been strong enough to visit as much as I used to do ; but I still do some visiting every day on five days a week, especially among the sick of the congregation.

(9) I have always thought it an important part of a vicar's duty to keep in his parish, to be at hand if any one wishes to see him. I have not thought it right to leave the parish often, except for the work of some religious societies to which I belong ; and friends and relatives round London have again and again complained that we would not visit them. But I think a vicar should be at home in his parish to see any one who needs him. And looking back over twenty years (except on my weekly day of rest, when I attend only to pressing parish matters), I cannot remember once turn-

ing away from my door, or keeping long waiting during my meals, the humblest of St. Thomas's people without seeing them and helping them according to my ability and conscience.

(10) The private interview in the Study is a greater part still of a clergyman's duty. And certainly crowds of persons, I may say, have one by one come to me in this way (during the twenty years I must have had thousands of such interviews),—persons needing a testimonial or reference; lads emigrating to distant lands coming for a few words of prayer and farewell; Confirmation candidates; young folk on the evening of the day they came of age; people who had just had some great good fortune; troubled souls in all kinds of difficulty, doubt, sorrow, sin. And I venture humbly to hope that, because in my heart of hearts I really cared for these people, by God's mercy some good may have been thus done with them face to face. That is the real kind of good for a servant of Jesus Christ to pray for and strive for; not work that is public before the world, but the work of the Spirit in the hidden lives of his brethren.

(11) The Church fabric has been restored. Inside: the Sanctuary has been entirely re-

ornamented with pictures of our Saviour, candlesticks, curtains, banners, candelabra ; four other oil paintings have been placed in the Church ; four new stained-glass windows have been erected, one in memory of the Rev. H. W. Reynolds (given by his friends), two memorial windows given privately, and the large People's Window, which has been raised at a cost of £160 from small gifts of the congregation (extending over some fifteen years), and one-fifth part of which remains to be finished ; entirely new lighting and heating of the Church has been carried out. Outside : some twelve years ago we raised about £900 to re-point and restore the whole external fabric, including the tower ; some eight years ago we raised about £600 to build new Vestries and to demolish the old Vestry, and to move the organ ; we have bought a piece of land for £500 (of which £300 remained from moneys for building the Mission Hall during the Rev. H. W. Reynolds' incumbency, and £200 was given to me for the purpose by Lord Camden), situate in Jeffreys Street, and it is intended (D.V.) that on it shall be built a Parish Hall.

Of this long list of new works some have been originated and started altogether by

myself, others by some of my workers, under my superintendence.

For there has been with me all the time a fine band of lay helpers. When last the list was typewritten in 1913 they numbered 190; many of them have been noble toilers in the Christian Cause. It would be invidious and unfair to pick out from that present list any names for mention, unless it were the respected veteran of our workers, Mr. H. W. Cocking. From those who have left our Church I single out for their excellent work, among many others, eight chief officials: the Rev. J. H. Ireland, Mr. Walker (Scripture Reader), Mr. Leslie Stephen and Mr. Crossman (Organists), Mr. Harrison, Mr. Love, Mr. Jarvis (Churchwardens), Mr. Waterfield (Sidesman). From those who have crossed the great River and entered into Rest let me reverently name: Mr. Rowley (Sidesman), Mr. J. A. Capon (Churchwarden), Mr. Wayland (Churchwarden), Mr. Myers (Churchwarden), Mr. Rowlatt (Churchwarden), Mr. W. Moore (Sidesman), Mr. Fenn (Sidesman), Mr. Kerrish (Sidesman). I do not name, but I profoundly reverence the memory of, our faithful Christian Women Helpers who have died in the Lord.

I thank all these, and I thank the great body of St. Thomas's parishioners, for being kind and true to me. I have always said you were a true-hearted people. You have not done all I could wish, and many of you, certainly, have not attended God's House as you ought; but I have always said at my home at Warwick, 'They are a true-hearted people.' And I have always borne up your name before God day by day for twenty years. Wherever I have been—and I have travelled into many countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa—I have always daily remembered you, especially those among you in particular trouble or temptation, before the Throne of God, and have asked His Guidance and Blessing on you. That again, I say, is the real work. All those clubs, and socials, and services, and bricks and mortar are but *machinery*; the real object is to bring the souls of men, amid the struggles and trials of this darkling world, Home to the Great Father's Love through Jesus Christ Our Saviour.

No clergyman rightly can work twenty years in a parish without often feeling his own errors and unworthiness, and often owning them in bitter humility and penitence; but that is between him and his Maker. 'If Thou, Lord,

wilt be extreme to mark what is done amiss :
O Lord, who may abide it ? For there is mercy
with Thee : therefore shalt Thou be feared.'

And now, I am not as strong as I was and cannot do as I did, especially since the nervous breakdown I suffered four years ago ; I cannot now do enough to satisfy myself. I have felt this particularly during the past two or three weeks. So I shall retire before long. I propose to continue the work (D.V.) for seven more months, till the 1st of November. And I ask you to stand by me for the remainder of my time. If any of you, my Church Workers, are weary of me and hesitate, go somewhere else, wherever you wish ! Go in peace ! I want no half-hearted comrades. But if, as I have confidence, most of you remain ; and if the great body of St. Thomas's people keep as faithful to me as they for years have been, then let us march together in the Name of the Lord along this last turn of the road towards the City that hath the Foundations. After that I will say to you ' Good-bye,' and will give up the charge (though not the love) of you to the Master of us all.—Your Friend,

HUBERT HANDLEY.

ST. THOMAS'S VICARAGE,

April 1914.

XV

NATIONAL IDEALS

(A Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on the Second Sunday in Advent, 5th December 1909)

‘Who is the King of Glory?’—PSALM xxiv. 10

IT is a picturesque scene. The religious procession winds its way up the hill, bearing the Ark, clad in the flowing robe and bright colour, moving with the ease and dignity of the East. Reaching the fortress at the top, the singers give out the challenge, ‘Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in.’ From within the walls voices are heard chanting the reply, ‘Who is the King of Glory?’ And the waiting company outside for rejoinder throws back the faith of their nation, ‘The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory.’ Turn from their Palestine to our England. For us in our country, here and now, Who is the King of Glory? What is our national ideal? What

is our highest good ? What engages, entices, compels us ? What as a nation are we actually after ? Eager men lead varied processions of followers to the heart of this English people, and they cry, ' Lift up your heads, O ye gates of the heart of the people, and let in our policy, our programme, our scheme of life, and the national welfare will be furthered or even secure.' Let us note several among many current imperfect ideals, and then let us spell out once more for our land the immortal Christian dream.

THE IDEAL OF MERE MATERIAL EMPIRE

There is the ideal of mere material empire, of geographical increment, of mere size. You stand before a map of the world on Mercator's projection, and you observe large areas on the map to be coloured red. The ideal we now speak of is the bare aim to extend that red ; the bare desire to get. We do not now speak of the spread of a powerful race under pressure of some world-wide vocation or destiny ; of the old sons of adventure launching forth from our coasts to subdue the dark places of the earth and to bear to them a civilisation ; in that huge endeavour, with all its sins in prac-

tice, there was a purpose of moral fibre. But we speak now of the aim of mere acquisition, of mere geographical appetite, and we say that that ideal is not good enough for our country ; it is an old temptation of nations. It was tried in dramatic circumstances a hundred years ago among our gifted French neighbours. Napoleon, striding across Europe, proclaimed the gospel of mere material empire in loud bold tones. Our own Byron, not always a prophet, was a prophet here, ' where guilty glory glows,' as he says ; and he well sums up for us the lesson of the instructive Napoleonic failure :

Not till thy fall could mortals guess
Ambition's less than littleness.

That ideal is not good enough for our loved land. The stately figures of the Abbey around us protest against it, protest against an ideal of mere size, of mere bigness ; they stand, on the whole, enduring witnesses for quality, for moral values, for virtue. And this book (the Bible), which searches far deeper down into the laws of life than all of us, puts on one side that whole class of aspiration with one quiet and final estimate—it is vain-glory.

THE IDEAL OF PLEASURE

There is the ideal of pleasure, luxury, softness, ease. We do not refer to pleasure as a refreshment from toil, as a recreation for some steep path of duty ; but of pleasure as an end, as an abuse, of existence. Consciously or unconsciously, our generation of Englishmen is undergoing the supreme test, the test of prosperity. Our fathers, by simple virtues, by toughness and endurance, built up for our country a vast dominion and the solemn trust of a great name. And now the winds of prosperity blow up with added force the old trials and temptations—drink, vice, gambling, sensationalism, insanity, ill-health in the large towns, unruliness and want of discipline among the children, unemployment, pleasure. The winds of prosperity blow up these waves of temptation which break and eat away at the base of the rock of our might. Let us attend now to one of them—extravagant pleasure. Hear how those who revisit our shores after years of absence regard this ugly feature of our present national habit. Listen to a bishop and to a distinguished foreigner. The Bishop of Carpentaria, North Australia, writes, ‘In the

first place there has been [in England] an enormous increase in luxury and ostentation, of living side by side with the most terrible depths of poverty and unemployment. The old simplicity of life seems largely to have disappeared. . . . Many of the clergy and the most devout laity seem to have forgotten the practicability of the example of Christian restraint and simplicity of life.' Count Hirosawa, a representative of the keen-eyed Japanese, revisits us and says, 'I notice a distinct and lamentable deterioration in the character, habits, and actions of the English people.'¹ Brethren, these repeated indictments are serious. It is a grave decline to change from the old virtues to voluptuousness. Men and women are wanted more and more who will face this temptation, and will quell it; who will come out and live manly and womanly lives of simple, lofty aim, with ideals not of self-indulgence, but of hardihood for the common good. 'England hath need of thee.' 'Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid. . . . My people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit.'

¹ Repeated from page 194.

THE IDEAL OF LIFE WITHOUT THE ETERNAL

The ideal of life without the Eternal. Let us note this ideal, not in the realm of thought. The preacher has little claim to speak there, and the current of thought in England is avowedly now idealistic, which for Christians is a gain. But let us note that ideal of life without the Eternal in the realm of action. An impressive, momentous fact of our time is the Social Movement. What is the Social Movement? It is this. The masses of the people, the multitude in the back streets of the great cities, believe that their lot in life can be bettered, that their lot in life ought to be bettered. 'Give us health, give us hope, give us leisure, give us knowledge, give us beauty.' That cry of the crowd is commanding the allegiance of every generous heart; the fires of enthusiasm and magnanimity are already lit in its favour; and may trained thought and dogged self-denial go to its achievement! But is it a complete ideal? Does it at all cover the amplitude of life? An aim which shall shape and amend a man's circumstances, the things which stand around him, but which shall not touch the man himself in the sacred

recesses of his being—is that aim, however for its own restricted end it may be heroic and indispensable, adequate for English national life? Yet is there not a tendency that the ideal of social reform shall monopolise the field of vision; shall edge out delicate, profound realities; shall become bigoted, headstrong, blind? Did not that foreign Minister of State placard for us the danger when, in a foreign Parliament, he said, ‘We have put out in the heavens the lights that will never be lit again. . . . You have deprived men of heaven, you must give them the earth in its stead’? Will that do? That English national life should be cut off from its moorings in the Eternal—is that notion permissible? Is it bearable? We here pit against that programme the saying of a great seer, the author of *The Imitation of Christ*, ‘In the long run that man will remain small who in all things does not seek the one, great, Eternal Good.’ And, indeed, for us Christians the relation of earth to heaven, of activities directed towards the seen, to activities directed towards the unseen, was once for all uttered in august and imperishable words, ‘Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of goodwill.’

THE IDEAL OF BLIND ORTHODOXY

There is the opposing ideal, with its correlative imperfection, of blind orthodoxy. There is the orthodoxy which is blind mentally, offering to the hungry people crackling theological dead leaves, while the people is craving for the living sap from the living roots in the living God. There is the orthodoxy which is blind morally, whose chief, not subordinate, interest appears sometimes to be not the large, tender, consummate morality of the New Testament, but the morality of ecclesiastical detail, of rubric, ritual, formality. And so it happens that at a Church Congress the one packed and vehement meeting often is concerned, not with the vital grandeurs of our faith or practice, but with the smoke of ceremonial dissension. Many of you have visited a cathedral in some foreign town where the Church has lost its hold on the people. There lies the city in the hollow, full of life, vibrating with life; you can hear the murmur, the din of its energies; it is charged with human interest, charged with human pathos, nobility, joy, sorrow, sin. And there up on the hill stands the beautiful old church, in melancholy

detachment, puzzled, behindhand, empty ; and as you walk the aisles, among the dusty monuments, your footfall seems to echo round the roof, 'Ichabod ! Ichabod ! — the glory is departed !'

THE IDEAL OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

What is the ideal of the Christian Church ? Here at this hearth of our religion, at this our immemorial meeting-place with the Ancient of Days, can we for our land spell out our Christian dream ? By the grace of God we can. Not long ago, in my poor parish, in the middle of the night I was called up by a young costermonger. He wanted me to visit his dying sister in a loft over a stable. I found kneeling round the bed three or four other young costers—rough, close-cropped, ragged—the husband and other brothers of the dying girl. They wanted the minister to read to the young woman as she entered the valley of the shadow of death the simple mission hymn, 'God be with you till we meet again.' Brethren, what was it in those rough lads' souls that urged them to that conduct ? It was the same deep instinct which, eleven years ago, here at Mr. Gladstone's open grave, led the gathered intellect and

character of England to express its inward need before the tremendous fact of death in the lines, 'Rock of Ages, cleft for me, Let me hide myself in Thee.' But what was that instinct? What was the urging force in those people's hearts, in the hearts of those humble costers, and of that rare and gifted congregation? What was it? Brethren, it was the reverence of our race; it was, thanks be to God, the inbred piety of the English people. That reverence still is here, in deep, dumb, unfathomed supply in the hearts of the people, breaking out on occasion in jets of speech, like the costers' or the cathedral hymn. But that reverence needs new expression. It is perplexed and baffled in our day of mental disturbance. For the moment our most holy religion is obscured from men's view; it is half concealed by worn-out clothes—worn-out science, worn-out history, worn-out criticism. The religious problem, the religious hope of our age is that we shall reclothe it, shall reclothe the Revelation of Jesus Christ in the fit and shining raiment of the best knowledge of our time. Then our fellow-countrymen will find in the future, as their fathers found in the past, that our most holy religion, the Gospel and Church

of Jesus Christ, holds within it what we want—the clue to the mystery of our being and the abiding secrets of the Eternal. That, then, is the primary problem—the religious problem and hope. *Then* comes the other urgent problem and hope of our time—the social problem and hope. *Then*, with the roots of the national life laid deep down in Eternity; *then* come up to the surface, to this world of time and space, look into the face of your brother man, look into his eyes, clasp his hand, love him and help him; *then* go out and heal the sick, relieve the oppressed, lift heavy burdens, champion the broken-hearted, mend human society. In this sense we preach to you once more the old Advent message; thus do we interpret the old, superb symbolism, ‘Lo! He comes with clouds descending.’ Brothers and sisters, in the secret places of your being become wholly His; then serve your country, serve your troubled brethren in His Name. For ‘His salvation is nigh them that fear Him: that glory may dwell in our land.’

SUPPLEMENT

TWO PETITIONS FOR FREEDOM PRESENTED TO
CONVOCATION ON 28TH APRIL 1914

I

FROM THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

*To The Right Honourable and Most Reverend Father
in God Randall Thomas, by Divine Providence
Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England
and Metropolitan, President, and to The Right
Reverend the Bishops of the present sacred Pro-
vincial Synod or Convocation of the Province of
Canterbury in Convocation assembled.*

THE HUMBLE PETITION of the undersigned sheweth
that

Whereas matters of grave import have lately been
brought before your Reverend House concerning the
intellectual freedom of the Clergy and the relation of
Episcopal to non-episcopal Churches :

We, the Council of the Churchmen's Union, desire
respectfully to lay before your Lordships' House the
urgent considerations following :

- I. The Church of England has at all periods since
the Reformation included both those who do
not and those who do accept the doctrine of the
' Apostolical succession ' and the necessity of

Episcopacy as a matter of *jus divinum*. We earnestly trust that your Lordships will do nothing to curtail the liberty in this respect which the formularies of our Church allow, and which its Clergy and Laity have hitherto in practice enjoyed.

- II. We trust that nothing will be done to make it more difficult for individual Bishops, other Clergy, and Laymen, to act as their own conscience and judgment direct in the matter of co-operation and religious fellowship with the members of non-episcopal Churches.
- III. We regard it as a matter of grave importance that the Clergy should be encouraged to study and discuss reverently and freely the critical and historical problems which are forced upon the modern student of the Old and New Testaments, to publish the result of their studies, and to face the task of interpreting and restating the traditional doctrines of Christianity in such ways as may be demanded by newly discovered truth.
- IV. While asserting without reserve our belief in the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, we submit that a wide liberty of belief should be allowed with regard to the mode and attendant circumstances of both.
- V. We believe that real study, thought, and discussion will be discouraged if clergymen, who, in matters not affecting the essential truth of Christianity, arrive at conclusions which

are opposed to traditional or momentarily dominant opinions, are to be removed from their offices or denounced as dishonest for retaining them. We venture to recall to your Lordships the dictum of Archbishop Temple, '*If the conclusions are prescribed, the study is precluded.*'

VI. We dutifully and respectfully pray your Lordships to remember how often in the past, when the Episcopate or the Convocations have attempted to pronounce authoritatively upon scientific, critical, or historical questions, they have committed themselves to positions which are now by practically universal consent admitted to be untenable.

With earnest prayer for an outpouring of the Spirit on the deliberations of your Reverend House.

C. T. DYKE ACLAND, Bart., Holnicote, Taunton, Somerset.
(President.) Formerly Ecclesiastical Commissioner.

P. H. BAGENAL, B.A., Harrogate, H.M.I. Local Government Board.

F. C. CHANNING, Fellows Road, N.W., I.C.S. (retired).

F. DAUSTINI CREMER, M.A., formerly Rector of Keighley and Hon. Canon of Ripon, Vicar of Seaford.

G. HENSLOW, M.A., formerly Professor of Botany, St. Bartholomew's Hospital.

H. RASHDALL, D.Litt., F.B.A., Canon of Hereford, Fellow and Tutor, New College, Oxford.

PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., Professor of Classical Archæology, Oxford.

W. D. MORRISON, LL.D., Rector of Marylebone.

HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Camden Town.

T. L. PAPILLON, M.A., Hon. Canon of St. Albans. (Chairman of the Council.)

A. J. BANNISTER, M.A., Canon of Hereford.

RONALD BAYNE, M.A., Rector of St. Edmund's, Lombard Street.

A. N. BAX, M.A., Rector of Maperton, Wincanton.

W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A., Vicar of St. Sepulchre, London.

HERBERT DALE, M.A., Vicar of Hornechurch, Essex.

J. A. DODD, M.A., Rector of Ewelme, Oxford.

CYRIL W. EMMET, M.A., Vicar of West Hendred, Steventon.

JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Vicar of Leigh Woods, Clifton.

M. G. GLAZEBROOK, D.D., Canon of Ely.

A. W. JEPHSON, M.A., Hon. Canon of Southwark, Rector of Ecton.

KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D., Professor of New Testament, Leiden University.

H. LAWRENCE, M.A., Rector of Bulmer, Yorkshire.

A. L. LILLEY, M.A., Archdeacon of Ludlow.

H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A., Vice-Principal of Ripon Clergy College, Rector of Copgrove.

CAVENDISH MOXON, M.A., Rector Designate of Marske, Richmond.

ARTHUR A. PEARSON, C.M.G., Petersfield.

LUCY REITH, Ilkley, Education Committee of West Riding C.C., Yorks.

H. G. ROSEDALE, D.D., F.S.A., F.R.S.L., Victoria, S.W.

S. J. SAVAGE (Hon. Treasurer), Lloyds.

RICHARD STAPLEY, Kt., J.P., Bloomsbury Square.

C. J. SHARP, M.A., Vicar of Christchurch, Crouch End.

- C. R. SHAW STEWART, M.A., Chelsea, late Rector of Cowden.
- J. E. SYMES, M.A., Kensington, formerly Principal of University College, Nottingham.
- R. B. TOLLINTON, B.D., Rector of Tendring, Essex.
- R. WARNER, F.C.A., Walbrook, E.C.
- W. C. D. WHETHAM, F.R.S., Fellow and Tutor, Trinity College, Cambridge.
- J. R. WILKINSON, M.A., Rector of Winford, Bristol.
- FERGUS WOOD, M.A., Vicar of Caterham Valley, Surrey.
- FRANCES M. YOUNGHUSBAND, Clifton.
- W. MANNING, M.A., Rector of Chipping Barnet, Herts. (Secretary.)

II

FROM THIRTY-SIX EMINENT CHURCHMEN

Clauses III., IV., V., and VI. (not Clauses I. and II.) of the above Memorial were signed and presented as a separate but concurrent Petition by the following leaders and teachers in the Church :

- W. R. INGE, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's.
- R. H. CHARLES, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., Canon of Westminster.
- .. W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., Canon of Westminster, formerly Bishop of Ripon.
- A. CALDECOTT, D.D., D.Lit., Dean and Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy, King's College, London.
- .. B. H. STREETER, M.A., Fellow, Dean, and Lecturer, Queen's College, Oxford.
- J. W. LEIGH, D.D., Dean of Hereford.
- H. G. WOODS, D.D., Master of the Temple.
- J. M. THOMPSON, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

- W. W. CAPES, M.A., Canon of Hereford.
- J. M. WILSON, D.D., Canon of Worcester.
- T. C. FRY, D.D., Dean of Lincoln.
- J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, D.D., Hon. Litt.D.
- C. H. O. DANIEL, D.D., Provost of Worcester College, Oxford.
- W. DANKS, M.A., Canon of Canterbury.
- F. C. BURKITT, F.B.A., Hon. D.D., D.Theol.h.c., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
- R. H. KENNETT, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge, Canon of Ely.
- W. W. JACKSON, D.D., formerly Rector of Exeter College, Oxford.
- S. HOLMES, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.
- F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, D.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, Canon of Peterborough.
- W. MOORE EDE, D.D., Dean of Worcester.
- E. W. WATSON, M.A., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.
- A. HAMILTON BAYNES, D.D., Rector of the Cathedral, Birmingham, formerly Bishop of Natal.
- H. M. GWATKIN, D.D., Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.
- W. SANDAY, D.D., F.B.A., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.
- A. NAIRNE, B.D., Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London.
- W. PAGE-ROBERTS, D.D., Dean of Salisbury.
- A. A. DAVID, D.D., Headmaster of Rugby.
- G. H. RENDALL, B.D., Litt.D., LL.D., formerly Headmaster of Charterhouse.
- H. E. D. BLAKISTON, D.D., President of Trinity College, Oxford.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER, D.D., Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

E. A. ABBOTT, D.D.

J. GOW, M.A., Litt.D., Headmaster of Westminster School.

J. H. SKRINE, D.D., Vicar of St. Peter-in-the-East, Oxford.

H. C. BEECHING, D.D., Hon. D.Litt., Dean of Norwich.

H. M. SPOONER, M.A., Archdeacon of Maidstone, Canon of Canterbury.

J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge.

N.B.—In the year 1905 a Declaration on Biblical Criticism, which in purpose and claim closely resembled the above second Petition, was signed by 1725 clergy of the Anglican Communion scattered over the world. Soon afterwards an American Declaration, an exact copy of the English document, was issued by 77 leading clergy and laymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and was commended by them to their fellow-Churchmen.

In the year 1906 the two Declarations, with full lists of the signatories, were published by Messrs. A. and C. Black as a book. It is out of print (1914).

INDEX

A

Act of 1865, Clerical Subscription, 4-5; its insufficiency, 12-15.
 Acton, Lord, *Lectures on Modern History*, 170 *n*.
 Adderley, Rev. the Hon. J., 42-3.
Adeste, fideles, 144.
 Advent season, new reading of, 226.
 Agnostics, the Church's duty towards, 56-7.
 American Declaration on Biblical Criticism, 233.
 Amiel, 51.
 Anglican Church (*vide* Church of England).
Anglican Liberalism, 104 *n*.
 Animals, Christian morality concerning, 56 *n*.
 Anselm, St., 50.
 Archbishops' Committee on Finance, 160.
 Arians, the, 135.
 Arnold, Dr., 37.
 ——— Matthew, lines adapted from, 52.
 Articles, XXXIX, assent to, 4-5; difficulty of assent to, 6-9, 11-12.
 Ascension, the, with the Session, 146-7.
 Athanasians, the, 135-6.
 Augustine, St., 50, 102; the *Confessions*, 114-15.
 Authority is conservative, xiv.; in relation to progressive religion, xv.-xvi.; will yield at the ripe moment, xvi.

B

BACON, aphorism adapted from, xviii.
 Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., on dangers of clerical ignorance, 23-4.
 Bedwell, C. E. A., *The Increase of the Episcopate*, 171 *n*., 172 *n*.
 Benedictine rule, a, 111.
 Benson, Archbishop, 16 *n*.
 Beresford, Lord Charles, on dangers to English character, 190-1.
 Bernard, St., *On Consideration*, 115.
 Bible, the, capable of new life and meaning, 108-9.
 Biblical Criticism perplexing younger men, 7; what it is, 72-4; like a glacier, 149.
 Bishops, resolution of, concerning Liberal Clergy, xiii.; have made mistakes in Synod, xvii.; suggested resolution of against Liberal Clergy, 149; in a future Senate, 172-3 (*vide* Opulence).
 Black, J. Sutherland, xvii.
 Blandford, Marquess of, 171.
 Booth, Rt. Hon. C., 40, 165.
 Brassworkers of Berlin and of Birmingham, 192-3.
 Broad Churchmen (*vide* Modernists).
 Bryce, Viscount, 177-8.
 Bunyan, *Grace Abounding*, 116.
 Burke, xvi. *n*.
 Buxton, Mr., on Clerical Subscription Act, 4-5.
 Byron, 218.

C

- C.C.C., 59 *n.*
 Carlstadt, 10.
 Carlyle, Thomas, letter from, 22.
 Carpentaria, Bishop of, on English luxury, 219-20.
 Catechism, the, 118.
 Catherine of Siena, St., *Letters* of, 115.
 Catholics (*i.e.* Anglo-Catholics), 26-8; their early dislike of knowledge, 28-36; effeminacy, 36-40; few men in their congregations, 40; ill relations with Nonconformists, 40-1; their conceit, 41-3; their press, 43-4; decline in public worship due to them, 44 *n.*; their toil and heroism, 44-5.
 Chalmers, Dr., 122.
 Chase, Bishop, xiv.
 Chaucer, 74.
 Chevalier, Mr. Albert, 38-40.
 Christ, the Spirit of, 101-2.
 Church, Dean, 26, 180 *n.* 1.
Church Family Newspaper on episcopal opulence, 156.
 Church of England, a prayer for, 60-1; worship of, 126; spirit of, 127-8; fails to rebuke luxury, 180-2, 180 *n.* 2.
Church Quarterly Review, 20.
Church Review on episcopal opulence, 155.
 Church, the, real crisis in, 89; absence of working class from, 90-1; fails to rebuke luxury, 180-2; duty to rebuke luxury, 184-5; failed to tell the truth to King Edward VII., 196; ideal of, 224-6.
Church Times on episcopal opulence, 154-5.
 Churchmen's Union, the, 59 *n.*; Memorial of, 227-31.
 Civilisation, vanities of, 99.
 Clement of Alexandria, 101.
 Colleges, theological, 57, 81.
Constructive Quarterly, 148 *n.*

- Convocation, Upper House of, resolution of, xiii.-xviii.; ignores episcopal opulence, 159.
 Coster's death-bed, a, 224.
 Creed, the Athanasian, 49 *n.*, 52 *n.*; fractured in Westminster Abbey, 65-6, 65 *n.*, 67-8; immorality of recital, 66-7.
 — the Christian, revision of, 134, 134 *n.*; gradual symbolical interpretation of, 139.
 — the clergy recite representatively, 136-8.
 — the Modernist, 102-3.
 — the Nicene, a modern reading of, 103-4; emerging from experience, 134-6; author's own interpretation of, 141-4.
 — What is a?, 133-4, 136.
 Crucifix, the, 102, 119-20.
 Cuthbert, St., 37.

D

- Daily Chronicle*, 153.
Daily News, the religious census of, 44 *n.*
 Darwin, 29, 30, 95.
 D'Aubigné, 108.
 Death, visiting the bed of, 87-8.
 Declaration on Biblical Criticism, 233; the American edition of, 233.
 Democracy, the, ignore the Church, 164.
 Descent, the, into hell, 63-5, 139, 145-7.
 Despair, never, 106-7.
 Dishonesty, Liberal Clergy accused of, 122-4.
 Disruption, a Broad Church?, 122.
 Driver, Professor, 95.
 Dry Church, the failure of, 223-4.
 Dürer, Albrecht, 63-5.

E

- EASTERN CHURCH in Russia, 143.
Ecce Homo, 114.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 168.
 Educated classes absent from Church, 79-80; why absent, 94-5.
 Edward VI., King, 196.
 Edward VII., King, influence of, 188; appeal to against luxury, 194-6; warning to from French history, 195; letter to, 197; letter from, 197; proposed petition to against luxury, 198-9.
 Emerson, 95, 98.
 Eminent Churchmen, Memorial of, 231-3.
 Empire, the lower ideal of, 217-18.
 England, what is the ideal of?, 216-17; the real glory of, 225-6.
 English Church Union, the, 69.
 — history, the moral fibre of, 217-18.
 — type of Christianity, 58-9.
Essays and Reviews, 33-6.
 Eternal, the, need of in national life, 222.
 Ethics, That-world ethics and This-world ethics, 118, 119.
 Eton Boating Song, 136.
 Evangelicals, 24-6, 78, 109.

F

FABER, F. W., 66.
Fatal Opulence of Bishops, *The*, 153.
 Fletcher of Madeley, 25.
 Flint, Professor Robert, 49 n.
 Florentine 'Burning of the Vanities,' 184.
 Fogazzaro, *The Saint*, 75.
 Franciscan Movement, the, 70.
 Fraser, Bishop, letter from, 20.
 Free Churches (*vide* Nonconformist Churches).
 — and open churches, 207.
 Freeman, E. A., 171.
 Funerals of the Poor, 205-6.

G

GARDNER, Professor Percy, 103-4, 143.
 George Eliot, 75.
 Gibson, Bishop, xiv.
 Gladstone, Mr. G. E., seconds a proposal to petition King Edward VII. against luxury, 199 n. 1.
 Gladstone's funeral, 224-5.
 Glory, national, the secret of, 225-6.
 — the King of, perplexed England asks who is, 77-8; Israelitic view, 216; Who is, for England?, 216-17.
 Goliath, the sword of, 109.
 Gore, Bishop, xiv., xvii., 53; on the Liberal Clergy, 144-6; his opposition to the Liberal Clergy criticised, 146-9; author's high respect for, 149, 159.
 Gospels, the, 102.
 Goulburn, Dean, 33, 34-5.
 Grattan on the English people, 39-40.
 Gray, Dr. H. B., *The Public Schools and the Empire*, 178.
 Green, T. H., 139 n.
 Gregory the Great, aphorism of, 59, 106.
 Grou, Père, *The Hidden Life of the Soul*, 116.
Guardian, 44 n., 143-4; on episcopal opulence, 154.

H

HALLAM, 182-3.
 Hamilton, Sir Ian, 184.
 Hardie, Mr. Keir, on Socialism, 163; ignores the Church, 164.
 Harnack, 95; indirectly censures episcopal opulence, 157-8.
 Hawthorne, 98.
 Herbert, George, 116.
 Heurtley, Professor, 33.
 High Churchmen (*vide* Catholics).
 Hildebert of Le Mans, 47.

Hirosawa, Count, on deterioration in English character, 194, 220.
 Historical science, 54.
 Hogarth, Mr. D. G., 95.
 Hooker, 50.
 Horton, Rev. R. F., 48 n. 1.
 Hügel, Baron Fr. von, xvi. n., 118, 128.
 Hugo, Victor, 75.
Hutchinson Memoirs, Colonel, 74.
 Hutton, R. H., 113.
 Huxley, 32.

I

IBSEN, *Brand*, 75.
 Ideal of mere empire, 217-18; of pleasure, 219-20; of secularism, 221-2; of blind orthodoxy, 223-4; of the Church, 224-6.
Imitation of Christ, The, 9, 108, 115, 120, 141, 222.
 Incarnation, the, a Modernist view of, 142-4.
 Inge, Dean, 51.
 Intemperance, alcoholic, 175; special temptation of the poor, 176; declining, 177.
 — voluptuous, 175; special temptation of the rich, 176; growing, 177; warnings against, 177-9.
 Interview with single souls, the, 86-8, 211.
 Isaiah, 101.

J

JAMES, Professor Wm., 48 n. 2.
 Japanese *samurai* sacrifice property, 167.
 Jesuit Movement, the, 70.
 Jevons, Professor S., 20.
 John, St., the Evangelist, collect, 111-12.
 Joubert, aphorism of, 71.
 Jowett, 35-6.

K

KEBLE, 32, 66, 116, 149.
 Ketteler, Bishop, 111.
 Kingsley, Charles, 59 n., 111.
 Knight, initiation of, 182-3.

Knox, Bishop, 180.
 Komura, Baron, on the Japanese simple life, 193-4.
 Kuenen, 95.

L

LABOUR PARTY, the, and episcopal opulence, 161.
 Lacordaire, 111.
 Lambert, Rev. Brooke, letter from, 96-7.
 Lambeth Conference ignores episcopal opulence, 159.
 Lamennais, 111.
 Lang, Archbishop, on episcopal opulence, 159-160; disseminating treatment of episcopal opulence, 160-1.
 Langton, Stephen, 37.
 Latimer, Bishop, 196.
 Laudian Movement, the, 70.
 Lavoisier, 50.
 Law, Wm., 116.
 Lecky, W. H., 24.
 Leigh, Sir Chandos, *Bar, Bat, and Bit*, 177.
 Leopold of Belgium, King, 181 n.
 Lessing, 34.
Liberal Churchman, magazine, 59 n.
 Liberal Churchmen (*vide* Modernists).
 — Clergy (*vide* Modernist Clergy).
 Liddon, 36 n. 1; *Bampton Lectures* of, 100.
 Lilley, Archdeacon, 181 n.
 Linnæus, 50.
Literature, 153.
 Lodge, Sir Oliver, 48 n. 2.
 London Diocesan Conference, 175, 199, 200, 200 n. 1.
 Louis XIV., 195.
 Low Churchmen (*vide* Evangelicals).
 Loyola, Ignatius, 58.
 Luther, 10-11, 108.
Lux Mundi, 53.
 Luxury, appeal to King Edward VII. against, 194-6;

warning from French history, 195; proposed petition to King Edward VII. against, 198-9; General Count Nogi on, 200 n. 2; denounced in the Abbey, 219-20.

M

MAJOR, Rev. H. D. A., editor of the *Modern Churchman*, 59 n.
 Manen, Van, 87.
 Manliness in religion, need of, 57-8.
 Martineau, Dr., *Life and Letters* of, 124; on the Liberal Clergy, 124; on Dean Stanley, 124.
 Materialism, French, a notorious case of, 222.
 Maurice, F. D., 59 n., 111, 167 n. 2.
 Mercier, Cardinal, 181 n.
Midshipman Easy, 58.
 Milburn's *A Study of Modern Anglicanism*, 70.
 Milman, Dean, 14.
 Milton, title-page; Wordsworth's sonnet to, 220.
 Mission to the Rich, 185, 186-7.
Modern Churchman, 59 n., 103 n., 113.
 Modernist Clergy, the, resolution of Bishops concerning, xiii.; its sympathy and restraint, xvi.; their duty of consideration for ecclesiastical superiors, xvii.-xviii.; unpopular, 59, 88, 120; let them examine their own honesty, 125; at home in the Church of England, 126-8; sufficiently numerous for recognition, 128-30; claim prevalence, 130-1; should avow their belief, 131-2; extreme, may remain in Holy Orders, 138-41; joy in Easter services, 148; have caught the ideal of work, 201.
 Modernists, 45-61; must be de-

vout, 60-1, 70-1, 118-19, 144; back to plain spiritual truth, 100-1; find Reality, 101; must conciliate Evangelicals and Catholics, 109.
 Monastic movements, 70.
 Montalembert, 37, 183.
 Montesquieu, *L'Esprit des Lois*, 195.
 Morley, Lord, *On Compromise*, 123.
 Morrison, Rev. W. D., founder of the *Liberal Churchman*, 59 n.
 Mozley, *On Miracles*, 100.
 Myers, F. W. H., 48 n. 2.
 Mystic movements, 70.

N

NAPOLEON, 91, 218.
 Naval College at Osborne, motto of applied to the Church, 174.
 New Zealand, Bishop of Christ Church on dangers to English character, 191.
 Newman, Cardinal, quotation from, 9; 10, 27, 113, 163.
 Newton, 49.
 Nicodemus, Gospel of, 64 n.
 Nietzsche, 106.
 Nogi, General, on luxury, 200 n. 2.
 Nonconformist Churches, Anglican exclusiveness concerning, 40-1, 55; their spiritual force, 180 n. 2; fail to rebuke luxury, 180 n. 2; Anglicans on good terms with, 209 n.
North American Review, 190.

O

ONTARIO, a grand jury in, on gambling, 179 n.
 Open mind, need of among the clergy, 52-5.
 Opulence of Bishops, the fatal, 153; demand for reform, 154-8; Bishops' refusal to notice, 158-9; denounced, 160-2; Bishops' refusal to discuss, 166-7;

- Bishops begged to face and discuss, 167-8; how it could be remedied, 168-73.
 Orders, Holy, men prevented from taking, 3-4.
 Ordination, an, 111.
 Orthodoxy, blind, ideal of, 223-4.

P

- PALACES, episcopal, the *Guardian* disapproves, 154; should be put to common Church purposes, 169-70; the coal and gas bill for Fulham Palace, 169.
 Paley's *Evidences*, 100.
 Paris, municipal authorities abstaining from a church service, 92-3.
 Parish work, the real object of, 214.
 Pascal on the conversion of a sinner, 102.
Pascendi Dominici Gregis, xvi.-xvii., 181 n.
 Passmore Edwards Settlement, 199 n. 1.
 Pastor, the work of a Christian, 74-5.
 Pattison, Rev. Mark, letter from, 19.
 Pearson, *On the Creed*, 100.
 Personal influence, the secret of, 114.
 Pestalozzi, 135.
 Petre, Miss M. D., 181 n.
 Pfeiderer, Professor, 53.
 Piety of the English people, 225.
Pilot on episcopal opulence, 156.
 Pius x., xvi., 181 n.
 Plato, 101.
 Pleasure, ideal of, 219-20.
 Poor and rich, virtues and faults of, 176, 176 n.; should be equally regarded in a parish, 205, 207.
 Prayer, the experience of Christendom on behalf of, 118-19.
 Prayer Book, assent to, 5; difficulty of assent to, 6-9, 12; capable of new life and meaning, 108-9.
 Preacher, the, must experience his message, 107-8.
 Preaching to the educated, 76-80; on a yacht in the Mediterranean, 76-7; orthodox dislike of Liberal sermons, 78; orthodox pain from Liberal sermons, 79; to the uneducated, 80-2; street preaching, 82-3; in parochial missions, 83-4; in the parish church, 98-112; Liberal preaching must be positive, 109-10.
 Prevaricate, never, 106.
Private Secretary, The, 38.
 Prophet, need of a, 97.
 Provincial Press against episcopal opulence, 153-4.
 Puritan Movement, the, 70.
 Pusey, 30, 31; *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 32 n.
 Pythagoras, 122.

R

- RASHDALL, Canon, Preface, 104.
Record on episcopal opulence, 155.
 Reform of emphasis in doctrine, 65.
 Reformation, a new, needed, 94.
 Reimarus, 149.
 Religion, progressive, xv.-xvi., xvi. n.; a definition of, 141 n.
Religious Life of London, 166 n. 2.
 Renan, 95.
 Resolves in a Mission to the Rich, 186-7.
 Re-statement of doctrine, 62.
 Restoration of St. Thomas's Church, 211-12.
 Resurrection of Christ, 145-8.
 Rich, mediæval self-sacrifices of the, 182-3; call to modern self-sacrifices, 184-5.
 Ritualistic churches do not attract the working classes, 91.

Roberts, Earl, 194.
 Robinson, Dean Armitage, 140 *n.*
 'Rock of Ages' at a death-bed,
 88; at Gladstone's funeral, 225.
 Roman Catholic Church in
 Spain, 143; its grandeur and
 spell, 180 *n.* 2; fails to rebuke
 luxury, 180 *n.* 2.

S

SABATIER, Auguste, 147.
 Sacraments, administering the,
 84.
 St. Margaret's, Westminster, 69.
 St. Pancras Church Conference,
 proposed petition to King
 Edward VII. against luxury,
 198-200.
 — Distress Committee, 199 *n.*
 St. Thomas's Parish, Camden
 Town, N.W., letter to, 201-15;
 works and workers in, 204-13.
 Saints, the, 102.
 Sakya-Muni, 101.
 Sanday, Professor, Preface, 137.
 Schleiermacher, 82, 83.
 Scholasticism, farewell to, 100.
 Science, religion in accord with,
 144.
 Scotch Church, Free, severe to
 William Robertson Smith, xvii.
 — Churches, prospect of re-
 union, 122.
 Secularism, ideal of, 221-2.
 Selwyn, Bishop, 171.
 Services, Anglican, 84-5.
 Shaftesbury, Lord, 165.
Revised Catechism of the West-
 minster Assembly, 48 *n.* 3.
 Sick, visitation of, 87, 209.
 Sidgwick, Professor Henry, on
 clerical veracity, 124, 130, 132,
 136, 140 *n.*, 145.
 Signatories of two Petitions for
 Freedom, 229-33.
 Simple life, Thoreau's, 98-100;
 Liberal Clergy must lead, 111;
 plea for, in the Abbey, 219-20.
 Smith, William Robertson, trial

of, xvii.; *Life and Lectures* of,
 xvii. *n.*
 Snowden, Mr. Philip, on episcopal
 opulence, 167; on luxury, 178.
 Social reform a Modernist task,
 110-11, 119; a national duty,
 221.
 South, Robert, 37.
Speaker, 153.
Spectator, 153.
 Spencer, Herbert, 95.
 Spiritual experience the basis of
 Christian beliefs, 46-52.
 Stanley, Dean, 14-15, 16 *n.*, 30,
 124.
 Stanton, Rev. A. H., 91.
 Stipends, episcopal, proposed re-
 ductions of, 170-2.
 Stöcker, Pastor, 111.
 Storr, Canon Vernon, 122 *n.*
 Subscription, Clerical, difficulty
 of, 11-12, 14; proposed aban-
 donment of, 12-15.
 Symbolical interpretation of the
 Creeds, 139, 145-8; symbolical
 language in the Creeds, 145-8.
 Sympathies, wide, need of, 55-7.

T

TALBOT, Bishop, xiii.-xiv.
 Taylor, Jeremy, 37.
 Temple, Archbishop, 16 *n.*; on
 freedom of Biblical study, 229.
 Tennyson to F. D. Maurice, 167
n. 2.
 Thackeray, 75.
Theologia Germanica, 116.
 Thomas à Kempis (*vide Imitation
 of Christ*).
 Thoreau, 98-100, 101, 102.
Times, letter on dangers to
 English character, 189-90.
 Tillotson, Archbishop, 13.
 Tolstoi, 95.
Tom Brown's Schooldays, 58.
Tract XC., 68, 103.
 Tractarian Movement, early,
 26-7; the vices of success in,
 28; the, 68, 130.

Tulloch, Principal, letter from, 21.

Turgenieff, *Virgin Soil*, 173 n.

Tylor, Dr. E. B., 34.

Tyrrell, Father, title-page, 133 n., 134 n.

V

VAUGHAN, Dean, 13.

Visitation of the sick, 87; of the sick and poor, 209-10.

W

Walden, 98.

Weizsäcker, 147.

Wesley, 92.

Wesleyan Movement, the, 70.

Westcott, Bishop, 64-5; his *Gospel of St. John*, 100; 147.

Westminster Abbey, its appeal to the nation, 218, 224.

— Dean and Chapter of, 65-6, 67-8; their freedom, 69.

Westminster Gazette, 153.

Westminster, proposed gathering of Broad Churchmen at, 69-70.

Westward Ho!, 58.

What We Want, An Open Letter to Pius X., 181 n.

Whitefield, 92.

Wilberforce, Bishop S., 32.

— Wm., 24-5.

Wilkinson, Rev. J. R., Preface.

Will of God, 114-16, 117.

— of man, surrender of, 114-16, 117.

Willoughby de Broke, Lord, 183 n.

Wilson, Canon J. M., 16 n., 137.

Wimborne, Lady, 42-3.

Wimmer, *My Struggle for Light*, 116.

Winnington-Ingram, Bishop, 159, 166, 178, 199-200.

Wittenberg, burning of the Bull at, 68.

Wood, Rev. Fergus, Preface.

Wordsworth, 120, 194, 220.

— Bishop Christopher, 33, 35-6, 172.

Work, Liberal Clergy must, 111, 119.

Working class, kind of service required for, 55-6; absent from Church, 90; why absent, 90-1; causes of their alienation, 164-5; have lost faith in the Church, 167.

Wrede, 149.

Wyclif, 50, 74, 183.

Y

YEATMAN-BIGGS, Bishop, 159.

Young, teaching of the, 85-6.

204

Handley, H. 60601 204
H192

AUTHOR
Theological room.

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

60301

204
H192

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary

175 Ninth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

Please stamp date in left column, write your name legibly in center column and leave right column blank. Deposit circulation card in slot marked 'Circulation cards'.

There is no date due, but books must be returned promptly upon request. Do not lend books charged to you to others. You are responsible for them.

